FBIS
DAILY REPORT
CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 005 8 January 1980

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/SALT/MBFR

Studio Nine Program Highlights NATO Missile Decision [Zorin, Zagladin, Falin] AA 1
Kurdyumov Calls Shelving of SALT II 'Disquieting Turn' [PRAVDA 5 Jan] AA 14
U.S. Contends USSR Has Rejected Talks on Missiles [Kachanov] AA 15

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Security Council Resolution on Afghanistan Fails CC 1
    Soviet Veto CC 1
    Speeches Opposing Resolution CC 2
    CSSR, SRV Delegate's Speeches CC 3
    Backing of U.S. Letter [Dashkov] CC 4
USSR Abstains From Voting on UN Sanctions Against Iran CC 4

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Commentary on U.S. Reaction to Afghan Events A 1
    Svetlov Article [PRAVDA 5 Jan] A 1
    Zhukov Viewpoint [PRAVDA 6 Jan] A 4
Reaction, Comment to Carter's Speech on Afghan Events A 8
    'No Interest in Cooperation' [Ariyevich] A 8
    Spirit of Cold War [Glazunov] A 8
    Other Reaction to Measures A 9
U.S. Cannot Hide Responsibility for Subversion in Asia [PETKO, Gerisichev] A 10
Washington's Quest for New Bases Sharply Criticized A 11
    'Big Lies' Technique [Kozyakov] A 12
    Dmitriyev Commentary A 12
    Orlov in IZVESTIYA [6 Jan] A 13
    Christopher's TV Comments A 14
    Favorable Replies' on Bases A 14
Korionov: U.S. Uses Iran Crisis as Pretext for New Bases [PRAVDA 4 Jan] A 15
TASS Reports Departure of Nimitz From Naples for Persian Gulf A 16
Nimetz Leaves for Turkey To Secure Use of Bases A 16
    Mission: Tracking Stations A 16
    Suyetina Commentary A 17
Attempts To Try To Build New Mideast 'Military Base' A 17
Morozov Examines Muslim Anti-American Feeling [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Jan] A 18
Large Arms Deliveries to Taiwan Continues A 21
TASS Assails Development of F-X Combat Plane A 21

Keflavik Being Turned Into 'Key Nuclear Facility' by U.S. [Serebrayakov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Dec] A 23
Rejoinder Sees 'Political Color Blindness' in Brzezinski's Views [Andreyev in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Dec] A 23
Comment on U.S. Use of Force To Support Foreign Policy [Orlov] A 24
Dadyants Article Discusses Decline of U.S. Prestige A 24

CHINA

Reportage, Commentary on Secretary Brown's Visit B 1
Purpose of Visit [(Dzhirkevelov)] B 1
Western Press Cited B 1
Brown, Biao Meeting B 1
Sergeyev Commentary B 2
NOVOYE VREMYA Stresses Friendly Feelings Toward PRC People [Tavrovskiy, No 52] B 3

NORTHEAST ASIA

South Korean Democratization Attacked as 'Forced Maneuver' [Razuvayev in PRAVDA] C 1
'Power Struggle' in Seoul C 1
Planned U.S.-South Korean Military Exercise Reported C 2
'Attempt To Intimidate Population' C 2
Ohira's ANZUS Trip, Japan's 'Pacific Ocean Concept' Discussed C 2

SOUTH ASIA

Afghan Defense Ministry Statement Hits 'Imperialist' Forces D 1
Afghans 'Throng' Road To Meet Released Political Prisoners [Musin] D 1
Widespread Popular Support for Afghan Government Reported [Kornilov, Musin] D 2
Evidence of U.S., PRC Provocations Seen in Afghanistan [Kornilov, Musin] D 3
PRAVDA Reports Kabul Returning to Normal; Enemies Still Active [Demchenko, Mironov 6 Jan] D 4
IZVESTIYA Correspondents Report on Feelings in Kabul D 5
Mood of Confidence [Kassis, Rashidov, Jan] D 5
Indignation of People [Kassis, Rashidov, Jan] D 7
'Prominent Afghan Author' Slams U.S. Policy as 'Aggressive' D 9
Kabul Mayor Cited: U.S. 'Grossly Interfering' in Afghan Affairs D 9
Pakistan Viewed as 'Springboard' for Anti-Afghan Aggression D 10
Bad for People's Interests [Baykov in PRAVDA 7 Jan] D 10

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Kampuchean, SRV, Lao Foreign Ministers Meet E 1
Pen Sovan Discusses Military Situation in Kampuchea E 1
Le Duc Tho Cited on Vietnamese Troops in Kampuchea [PRAVDA 29 Dec] E 2
Alleged Vietnamese Use of USSR-Produced Toxins Denied [Aleksandrov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Dec] E 3
Cultural, Technical Cooperation Signed With Singapore E 3

WESTERN EUROPE

Suslov, Ponomarev Greet Marchais on Arrival in Moscow G 1
Ponomarev Confers With Norwegian CP Head in Moscow G 1
[PRAVDA 5 Jan]
Turkish Government Discusses Military Ultimatum G 2
[PRAVDA 5 Jan]
Antiterrorism Bill G 2
[Filippov in PRAVDA 5 Jan]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

'Hooligans' Attack Afghan Embassy in Tehran H 1
Activities of CIA, SAVAK 'Stepped Up' in Iran H 1
Khomeyni on Armed Clashes H 1
Waldheim Opposes Use of Force To Free Hostages H 1
Report on Visit H 2
IZVESTIYA Notes Saudi Arabian Military Changes H 2
[Tuchnin in IZVESTIYA 3 Jan]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Ethiopia Announces New Government Appointments J 1
[PRAVDA 3 Jan]
Central Committee Greets Congolese Party on Anniversary J 1
[PRAVDA 31 Dec]

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Report Adoptions of Election Candidates R 1
Grishin Attends Moscow Constituency Pre-Election Meeting R 1
Dobrynin Awarded Order of Lenin R 1

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

CSA Reports January-November 1979 Stockraising Figures T 1
[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 52]
Radio Reports Agricultural Developments for 26 December T 3

STUDIO NINE HIGHLIGHTS NATO MISSILE DECISION

LD032120 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 22 Dec 79 LD

["Studio Nine" program with Valentin Zorin, PRAVDA political observer; Vadim Zagladin, first deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee International Department and Valentin Falin, first deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee International Information Department]

[Text] [Zorin] Good afternoon, comrades. There are many important events going on in international life, among which are events which unfortunately have a negative effect in the balance of modern international politics. I mean primarily the recent decisions of the NATO Council. Washington succeeded, with the help of some of its allies, in forcing through the decision on the deployment of American Pershing II medium-range missiles in Europe, and also the announcement by the U.S. President of the 5-year plan envisaging a considerable increase in American military programs. I would like to emphasize that it is not a question of some routine regular political steps but rather one of Washington's and other NATO countries' leaders adopting important decisions signifying a quite definite and essential change in their policies. This was done despite the proposals made by the Soviet Union, those put forward in the speech delivered by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev on 6 October in Berlin, which opened serious possibilities for practical steps directed at further strengthening detente, the deepening of the process of detente and the relaxation of military confrontation in Europe.

Very authoritative specialists in the sphere of international relations, in evaluating these recent events, say that these steps taken by Washington and its allies have led not only to some change but to emergence of a new political situation in international politics. I would like to begin today's talk by asking whether it is really possible to qualify the situation in this way and to talk of a new situation. Valentin Mikhaylovich, give us your opinion on this subject.

[Falin] What is new in this situation? Primarily it is the fact that the majority of the NATO members have adopted a military doctrine under U.S. pressure directed toward increasing confrontation with socialist countries in Europe and in other parts of the world. A corresponding military-technical foundation is being placed under this new military doctrine. Toward this end it is planned to deploy in Western Europe 572 launching units for American nuclear missiles, as was announced. This creates a new situation even before these missiles are in position. Another important aspect is that NATO has virtually given its refusal--and I emphasize "virtually"--to directing matters toward decreasing the level of military confrontation in Europe. NATO cut the ground from under the talks which could and should have been held in order to supplement political detente with accords in the field of military detente. There was a possibility, a real possibility of this.

Let us imagine that the Soviet proposals put forward by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev in Berlin on 6 October became a subject of serious, thoughtful talks, and that our proposal on the immediate holding of such talks had been accepted, even without waiting for the ratification of the SALT II treaty, which is still wandering through the labyrinths of the U.S. Senate. Each one could naturally express his anxieties and worries during the talks we proposed, and not from a position of pressure and threats as the NATO members are doing now, but from a position of searching for real solutions and real accords. They should be accords serving mutual understanding and not directed against one another.

Not one of the serious politicians had or could have any doubts about our readiness to hold such talks. Leonid Ilich Brezhnev said in Berlin that we are ready to consider the corresponding proposals on mutual confidence. We are even ready to take definite unilateral steps to insure that military detente in Europe makes a real advance. Our October initiatives logically continued the previous efforts of the Soviet Union in this sphere. It is a fact, a fact which cannot be disputed and is not disputed in the West. It is a fact, which among others is recognized by President Carter, that during the last 10 years the number of nuclear weapons carriers of medium range did not increase by even one unit in the western regions of the Soviet Union. And the weight of the nuclear charges carried by these carriers has been reduced.

Since this is so, our proposals on--or rather our statements, more precisely--on the readiness of the Soviet Union to proceed to further--if necessary, even unilateral--reductions of medium-range missiles could not provoke any doubts in anyone in view of these facts. However, the U.S. preferred acting differently. Disregarding everything, they deemed it correct for themselves to impose on their allies a program on the arms race in Europe. Why? Naturally, such a decision, an important decision, has its reasons. I think that we will mention these reasons during our talk. It is important now to mention something else. It is important to mention that by imposing their plan the Americans did not stop at anything, in fact forcing the small countries of the Atlantic bloc in particular to support them and to submit to their dictates.

[Zagladin] Valentin Mikhaylovich, allow me to add something. You have very correctly used the expression imposed because in fact it was necessary to impose it and it is a very important feature in this situation. The feature is that in Europe--and not only in Europe, but primarily in Europe--many political forces, social forces and some states understood the essence of our proposals and these proposals aroused a sympathetic attitude a feeling of fellowship among them and in general a readiness to hold negotiations. I would say that if one analyzes the situation in Europe just before the NATO session, from the public statements, it could be said that the governments of Belgium and Holland among the states where it was proposed to deploy the weapons, were in favor of negotiations rather than the deployment of missiles. Later the position became more defined in one way or another, but in any case, as is known, the Belgian and Dutch governments have postponed a final decision. Although a decision in favor of deployment was taken in Italy, there had been much discussion and the government and Prime Minister Cossiga stressed that it is necessary to negotiate and stressed the importance of Soviet proposals. If you consider the political forces, the widest range, including the Vatican, which in every way made it clear that it sympathizes with these ideas, up to the Socialist International and its various parties, primarily such parties as once more the Netherlands, Belgian, Spanish, Finnish, Swedish and Norwegian parties, made it clear that they stand for negotiations and follow the path proposed by our country. There has been opposition and there was no unity in this case as we can say openly now. This is an interesting problem because the question "why?" which you put forth immediately provokes a lot of other questions. I am sure we will return to them later.

[Falin] Why is this a question of principle? Taking everything into consideration, without touching on more profound reasons, the Americans regarded this proposal for talks in this way primarily because they feared that the talks can either postpone or show the general untenability of the foundations on which the American program is being imposed on the North Atlantic bloc. The Americans have seldom shown such contempt for public opinion, such disregard for the voices of parliaments, such disregard for the opinion of prominent political figures of the West as in this concrete situation.

To answer your question briefly it could be said roughly that first, NATO's decisions which are based on the new more aggressive American doctrine change the strategic situation in Europe. This is the aim of those decisions. And second, the chance to achieve a resolute turn toward detente in Europe at the present stage has been lost. It will be difficult to get such a chance again if the implementation of the plans adopted by NATO is started.

[Zorin] And so more or less this question has been dealt with. There is really reason to speak of a new situation.

[Falin] Unfortunately.

[Zorin] Unfortunately. Vadim Valentinovich, you and Valentin Mikhaylovich have already touched upon the answer as to why the leaders of Western powers and primarily Washington have rejected the proposals put forward by the Soviet Union, by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev on behalf of the Soviet state. The proposals are quite clear and quite precise. They have found wide understanding among wide public circles in the West if only because they correspond to the interests of the widest circles. And yet despite the obvious expediency of accepting these proposals they were still not accepted. I would like to ask you to continue explaining why.

[Zagladin] Alright. I have already said that it was a peculiar situation which can now be interpreted. The peculiarity of the situation was the fact that in this big political game involving the NATO decisions, some participants acted as though they were blind. They voted, or voted with reservations, for the adoption of some decisions while they did not know the final meaning and real aim of them. They may not know everything even now. It was a situation where some of the states who took part in this whole fervent discussion argued about one thing while it involved something totally different. It is a rare case, particularly when great powers are involved and when questions of the greatest importance concerning peace and security for an entire continent and for the entire world, are concerned. What is it all about? It is the fact that the external picture was presented in the following way by the West and primarily by the United States. The Soviet Union has increased its armaments. A reply is needed, the balance must be restored. For this purpose new missiles must be deployed in Europe and when this is done, talks can begin. And from a position of restored equality, restored justice, these talks can be successfully brought to a conclusion. This is how the West presented the picture. In fact, as Valentin Mikhaylovich has already said, first it was untrue that we have disturbed the balance. We did not disturb it and our armaments certainly did not increase as was said by our Western partners in previous talks and in present discussions. Second, this means that if the balance has not been disturbed, as was admitted by the Western politicians themselves a thousand times...By the way, it is interesting that no one says any longer that the balance was disturbed, this is not mentioned anywhere.

[Falin] Even the NATO communique did not mention it.

[Zagladin] Even the NATO communique did not mention it. Quite right. So the balance was not disturbed and there was no need to adopt retaliatory measures. The main point is that this lie is not an accidental lie. It is a lie which had to cover up a certain developing historical situation which I would like to speak about very clearly.

These are the facts. Maybe we have to go back to the beginning of the 1970's, the Vietnam crisis which struck the United States in the very heart, the energy crisis which caught America unawares. They did not expect that the recently so submissive former colonial countries would exert such sharp pressure and such strong resistance to the dictates of the West. There was the game of the monopolies which developed around all of this. All of this together created a new situation for the United States, from which various ways out could be found. For example, equal relations could be developed with the countries of the former colonial world or real peaceful relations could be developed with all countries. But another way out was chosen. The way selected consisted of a revision of doctrines and conceptions--it was just starting then--which continued for some time. However, the essence of that revision boiled down not to peace or to equal relations but to gradually going back to the policy of strength and from the positions of this policy and from those lines of departure attempting to handle the problems which have confronted the United States.

[Zorin] This is not really a way out, it is the illusion of a way out because there is no real way out on this path.

[Zagladin] I would say more than that. This is not only not a way out, it is not even an illusion of a way out. It is simply driving oneself into a dead end.

[Falin] Self-deception.

[Zagladin] It is self-deception and they are driving themselves into a dead end.

[Falin] However, it may be worth reminding ourselves that parity, as Laird said when he was U.S. secretary of defense, means that Americans must have six times more nuclear forces than the Soviet Union. Naturally, speaking from the position stated by Laird, when we mention parity it is difficult to achieve some sensible decisions as the other side would not accept such parity.

[Zagladin] This is the way that was chosen. During 1973-1974 the working out of these new doctrines began. If we speak about the United States,itself,, we can quote the following fact: In 1974 there was much discussion in the United States on the problem of increasing the efficiency of the NATO military potential in general. The United States itself proposed a complex of 140 measures of the most varied character which should be implemented. U.S. expenditures were sharply increased and it was announced that this work will continue. This is what was announced and what was known. Now for what was not announced at the time. Our viewers know from the newspaper PRAVDA that recently (Muelner) wrote from the GDR. He is a man who worked for NATO and crossed over to the GDR. He said some of the things that he very well knew about because he was one of the higher officials in this organization. Among the things he said is that in the summer of 1974, Schlesinger, then secretary of defense, and Leber, the FRG minister of defense, signed a secret agreement, according to which something like a joint commission was formed. It was disguised under a rather innocent title, something like a "working group." In fact it was a question of coordinating military measures and further development of military policy. That was when the foundation was laid for the actions which have now led to the NATO decisions. It was then that the question of these missiles began to be discussed. This was confirmed because in spring of 1975 the other NATO member-countries did not know that the FRG and the United States had some talks about it and that some kind of an operative group existed. In spring 1975 a new FRG minister of defense, Apel, said that in 1975 NATO analyzed its armed forces and concluded that it must modernize its nuclear potential in Europe.

Our viewers know about it, but I must mention once more that it was in 1975. Now they say that it was in reply to our armaments. However, the armaments in question, that is, SS 20 missiles being talked about in the West, were deployed after all these decisions were adopted. So there is no question of reply.

[Falin] There were no such missiles in the western part of the Soviet Union in 1975.

[Zagladin] No, there were not, so it is laughable to talk about a reply. This is how events developed. That is how it began.

[Falin] However, one thing has to be added, Vadim Valentinovich. This working group did not just work on technical implementation of joint American-West German plans. It was also falsifying data on the military potential primarily of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries as a whole. These falsified data were then shoved under the noses of the FRG and U.S. allies in NATO and served as a basis for all following discussions about the adoption of related decisions in this bloc. The falsification went so far and the exaggeration of the Soviet potential was so considerable that naturally the smaller countries in particular could have no real picture of the correlation of forces.

[Zagladin] This is one of the falsifications on which all the decisions were later based. If we return to and continue discussion of this subject, I will say that after this beginning there was naturally a continuation and a double continuation at that. The United States continued to develop its doctrine. It has already been talked about here in "Studio Nine," about the directives worked out in August 1977 by President Carter. Their essence was that a global war cannot be allowed as it would be too costly.

Second, because of that it is necessary to transfer the opposition to a regional level--Europe is the region. Finally, proceeding from this, it is necessary to activate and unite the allies for this purpose--for the American purpose--unite the allies. It is to the solution of this problem that the Brussels NATO session was essentially devoted.

A thought which may appear strange on the face of it has come to me at this point. At present there is much talk in the American press now that China accepts some American ideas, some of its trains of thought. Maybe. When one reads Carter's last speech, one gains the impression that the same thing may be happening in reverse. At one time Mao Zedong proposed a doctrine in accordance with which a nuclear war is not fearful. A certain number of millions of people would survive and that would be all right. Later this postulate was furthered and developed into three points.

First--The inevitability of war. Second--The war will break out owing to a conflict between two superpowers. Third--It will take place in Europe. China will remain aloof. At present the U.S. idea is quite obviously that if a war does break out between the great powers, let it be in Europe, and the U.S. will remain aloof.

[Zorin] Vadim Valentinovich, is it possible that such a really disingenuous game is not seen through in some Western European capitals? It is possible that they cannot see the very dangerous sting in this entire plan in, for example, Bonn, London and other capitals which now have played an active role in Brussels? It is dangerous for Europe.

[Zagladin] I understand. It can be said that there is something they do not know and something they do not see.

Second, it seems there are some pressures, as Vadim Mikhaylovich has already mentioned, which have worked already and which were being exerted on the U.S. allies with such force that they could not withstand them. There are various types of blackmail in this case. The FRG was an ally of the United States from the very beginning. During the 1970's there was not only a change in the correlation of forces between the forces of peace and the forces of war, between imperialism and socialism and so forth; there were changes in the correlation of forces within the Western alliance, between Europe and America. Europe feels much stronger in many ways than it did before.

[Falin] Inside Europe itself.

[Zagladin] Yes, inside Europe. I think one of the Americans' hidden goals, which they have probably not discussed even with their partners in this committee, the American-West German committee, is in the fact that this plan enables them to regain their hold on Western Europe in only one aspect, the military, to make it loosen its pursestrings so that it might be attached financially to NATO more securely, and from the political viewpoint to bind it with decisions restricting the West European countries' opportunities to develop more actively their relations with the East.

[Falin] And their independent actions regarding other countries.

[Zagladin] Quite right. One of the important goals is to restrict Europe's activity and to fetter its independence. All the pressure was for this purpose because there was no other way, and it was impossible to explain the reasons.

Finally, there are forces in each country of the NATO force which are interested in creating a colder climate than at present, in spending more on arms and so forth. Here is a simple example: They say that apart from the two American companies which are developing the cruise missile, there is another doing the same thing, which is an aerospace concern in West Germany.

[Falin] As far as we know, there is such a concern.

[Zorin] And which obviously expects to make a good profit out of it.

[Zagladin] And maybe not just the concern but all the businesses connected with it. In fact one can make several assumptions. It is a fact that there are circles interested in such a development of events. The last fact to be added to this is the internal political calculation. The development of the arms race and the strengthening of the position of the forces which are involved in the arms race were always supported by the rightist element. It always gives them an added possibility to exercise pressure on the left forces in European countries. I am sure that the internal calculations of those who supported it concern Europe.

[Falin] There are many political figures in America who say that detente weakens.

[Zagladin] Yes, yes.

[Falin] Detente makes Western people much too receptive to ideas of peace, to ideas of peaceful coexistence and to the possibilities of real far-reaching accords with socialist countries. Thus a certain degree of tension in relations between the West and the socialist world is not detrimental but is advantageous in the view of these public figures.

[Zagladin] In the days following the NATO decision the Western propaganda, which naturally watched very carefully the Soviet Union's reaction to these decisions, carried the first propaganda line saying that the Soviet Union's attitude to these decisions is sheer propaganda. It does not reflect the political positions, it is just propaganda. Together with this statement, it also says that the decisions adopted at the NATO Council session are quite compatible with the idea of the disarmament talks which the NATO countries are now proposing. How can this be reconciled?

[Falin] Aleksandr Sergeyevich Pushkin replied with a well-known epigram to a comparable subject. His words were as follows: "The pious widow's heart is devoted to God and her sinful flesh is devoted to Archimandrite Fotiy."

Many NATO figures say that their souls are devoted to detente and that they want good relations with the Soviet Union. But their actions and designs are directed at one thing: arms, increasing arms and modernization of arms. In one word--force. When people consist of contradictions, they are either uncomfortable or sometimes unpleasant, but when the policies of states consist of continuous contradictions, then these policies are dangerous. In the present situation it could be said that it is very dangerous, because with the present weapons systems which are already developed and stocked, lack of accord and attempts to bypass the interests of the other side and violate these interests as well is a rather risky occupation.

I think that every sensible person realizes by conviction and not just as a matter of form that there is no reasonable alternative to detente. If there is no reasonable alternative to detente, there is no reasonable alternative to disarmament, nor can there be. The attempts to breed a kind of unnatural hybrid detente with the continuation and even increase of the arms race are no more than a deliberate deception of the people. One can talk in an abstract manner as much as one likes about talks. The West German ministers and ministers of other countries are now saying: Let me sit down to talks immediately. They even demand that we give an immediate reply to some ideas--called "constructive" in the West--which are supposed to be in the NATO Council communique.

[Zagladin] They want to pretend that it is NATO now which is carrying the banner of peace and negotiations, and we object, refuse and so forth.

[Zorin] Although for more than 2 months there was ostentatiously no practical reply to the Soviet Union's proposals.

[Falin] Two months is a rather modest estimate because we had no reply since June of last year to some proposals made in Vienna. Other proposals from socialist countries have not been answered since last November. There has been no reply to the March initiatives of Leonid Ilich until now. One of them was the proposal on the nonuse of nuclear and nonnuclear weapons first and so forth. This explains the aim of the West to show that at present some obstacles to the talks have been removed from the Western viewpoint. This is intended to hide the fact that such obstacles to talks have been created. Barriers have been created for the talks which were possible until the last Brussels NATO session.

[Zagladin] I would like to remind you of something else. There is no doubt that the main purpose is to hide the fact that real conditions for real success in such talks have been wrecked. At the same time it is an attempt to force us to talk with them from a position of strength, so that they have the position of strength and that we, under pressure from this position, should make concessions.

If we analyze the NATO Council communique it becomes clear what they want. Here is one example: The means of medium-range action include different components. They can be missiles, they can be aircraft with missiles which they can deliver to a certain limit and then let them fly by themselves, they can be aircraft carriers with missile-carrying aircraft, submarines with missiles, and so forth. What do they propose to talk about now? About medium-range missiles, but only surface-based ones. This means that the Americans want to reach agreement on their missiles and we on our missiles, but that we should in no case put the question of other American means.

[Falin] Particularly of forward-based means.

[Zagladin] Yes, forwarded-based means which have existed since the fifties and against which we were obliged to develop our medium-range missiles. On the one hand there is the attempt to hide the fact that they have wrecked a real chance for talks, and on the other hand there is the attempt to force us to discuss conditions which they know are unacceptable. And they knew about that because Leonid Ilich has warned that such a basis is unacceptable, Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko said so, and the communique of the Foreign Ministers' Committee stated clearly that we cannot hold talks on such a basis--the basis of pressures of strength.

[Falin] In connection with the pressure now expressed in the statements of some Western politicians on the subject of talks and in connection with their attempts to represent the matter as though it now depends on the Soviet Union--and the Soviet Union alone--whether there will or will not be talks, I would like to say the following: It is not a question of talks in general, not of talks in theory, but of a quite specific subject of talks. Those states which rejected the Soviet Union's October initiatives and preferred talks from positions of strength rather than our proposal of equal talks, talks from the position of reason, should understand, or at least come to think of it, that by losing a sprat they will not necessarily catch a mackerel. It may also happen that will get nothing for their trouble. Experience shows that all the previous attempts at imposing somebody else's will on the Soviet Union and at dictating to us the conditions which are counter to Soviet interests and the interests of our friends have not been successful. Imperialist powers have often had an opportunity to see for themselves that one should not regard too lightly our cautions about consequences. And today there will be no exception to this rule, however much NATO should want it.

[Zagladin] This is quite natural because our country has spent one fourth of the 62 years of its existence repulsing enemy invasions and then overcoming their consequences. It is natural that we cannot forget this. The lessons of the past are a very important matter for us because even now there is not one family which does not remember the war because of its losses. Because of this no one will agree, not a single person in our country, to watch passively as the development of some actions directed against the Soviet Union is being started again. Naturally we proceed not from an understanding that one should prepare for some inevitable military actions, but from the premise that one must prevent such actions, and keep life tranquil for our people. Such measures must be taken, and this is why it is vain to hope that we will hold negotiations under threat.

[Falin] Those who say that the Soviet Union will, after all, agree to these negotiations deceive themselves and deceive others. In this connection, I would like to remind you of another feature. It is not just now that the Americans refuse to discuss the question of forward-based weapons. They refused to do this 5 years ago and earlier, and 1 year ago and 8 months ago. They display no desire to discuss this question at present.

If the NATO Council session communique is read carefully, it says among other things what the Soviet Union must do and what the socialist countries must do. These terms "must" and "they must" are used by the way. But there is no mention as to what the Western countries must do. They also keep silent about what positive action the Western countries will take. Naturally it is not from modesty. Speaking of this NATO communique in general, it can be said by paraphrasing a well-known expression that the mountains of weapons piled up by NATO gave birth to a diplomatic mouse. It is difficult to find a more hypocritical document than this communique in the diplomatic relations of recent years. It is difficult to find another document which uses so many words to represent black as white and to disguise the real meaning of decisions adopted by NATO.

[Zagladin] It may be necessary here to think of this subject. By submitting their proposals for the so-called talks now, they naturally want to put us in a difficult situation pretending that we are against the talks. It is not true. We proposed this idea and they have buried it at this stage. But if they think that in this way they will force us to give up the struggle for the aims we proposed--aims of detente, aims of a firm peace in Euorpe and the entire world, aims of an end to the arms race and disarmament--then they are profoundly mistaken. Naturally the Soviet Union cannot back off these aims and will never back off, but now we will have to act, taking into consideration the present situation. And this means that today we have new prospects.

[Zorin] Vadim Valentinovich, we have come to a question put to us by viewers in letters which have arrived in the last few days. If you allow me, I will read one of these letters and ask you to reply to the viewers who put the question. This letter is from a Muscovite, engineer Ivan Stepanovich Belov. He writes: The decisions of NATO bosses, which contradict the will and interests of the peoples, have been adopted. What comes next?

[Zagladin] This is what we actually began talking about.

[Zorin] Yes. This is why I read it.

[Zagladin] Of course, we cannot now implement the plan of actions which we proposed. Leonid Ilich spoke of our readiness, if NATO did not take the decision, to unilaterally reduce our medium-range missiles. Naturally there can be no question of that now. On the contrary, now it is necessary for us, together with our allies, about which, by the way, we also warned the West, to think of how to prevent a change of the present correlation of forces, an upsetting of this correlation in favor of the West. But at the same time we will undoubtedly work for the attainment of our goals, and this, certainly, will also be part of that work. While engaging in this work we must take into account not only this NATO Brussels decision, but also another factor, a substantial one, which is that the United States now displays its pressure by no means in Europe alone, and that it is trying to spread its pressure over the whole world, over the entire territory, so to say, of Europe, the Indian Ocean, the Caribbean, and, as far as possible, over other parts of the world, including Southeast Asia.

Here we must again return to President Carter's speech because it is a unique document of its kind, quite unique.

[Falin] Unique for our times.

[Zagladin] For our times.

[Falin] Because it repeats the ideas which have frequently been current in American policy.

[Zagladin] But it is one thing when President Truman said these things...

[Zorin] And Secretary of State Dulles.

[Zagladin] And Secretary of State Dulles, and it is another thing when the same ideas are expressed in a different era, with a different correlation of forces and with a different position of America itself in the world. By the way, it is possible that all this disarray in American policy stems from the fact that the United States just cannot become accustomed to this new situation. The Europeans were more pliable in this sense. They were more subtle in many cases.

This includes other countries as well. However, the United States absolutely refuses to take this into account and Carter really speaks in the language of Truman or Dulles. He says that he would like to hold talks. Yes, he also speaks of talks as does the communique. But he says straight that he would conduct the actions on the basis of his might. Then, what is this might needed for? Obviously not for the conduct of the talks. Then he says that this might is necessary for the conduct of policy from a position of strength or, as he said further, to strengthen the American leading role and influence on the world arena. Excuse me, but this is an open doctrine of hegemonism in international relations, it is a doctrine of affirmation of world mastery, if you like, by the United States. This is an absolute anachronism in present-day conditions, an anachronism which is doomed to utter failure. It is also self-deceit and very dangerous self-deceit. It is dangerous for the Americans themselves because it threatens complete miscalculation, and it is dangerous for others because what does it mean to conduct the matter from a position of force and to affirm the leading role of America? It means breaking the bones of other countries and peoples. This is what it means.

[Falin] It is worth adding one feature to this. In his speech the President essentially recognized the error of the American war in Vietnam and even more, he said that it was a groundless American interference in the internal affairs of other countries since America's vital interests were not affected there. At the same time he added that not every interference by the United States in any conflict or any situation has to turn into another Vietnam for America.

[Zagladin] So he is preparing for any interference in any region of the world without discrimination. It is necessary to take this matter into account also when we think of the future.

[Zorin] Well, since...

[Falin] I would like to continue. As Vadim Valentinovich has already said, an entire program has been proposed here. It is a very, very wide program. I would like to begin by saying that this program gives a shade of meaning to the sense of the Brussels NATO session decision. The 5-year American military program shows that we have to deal not with a particular phenomenon, we have to deal with a wider development of a policy, which, if this policy is implemented, could arouse serious tension and provoke the cataclysms mentioned by President Carter in his speech.

How does Carter justify such a militaristic program? On his general statement on the development of the correlation of forces which is unfavorable to America, not because of the Soviet Union's superiority, the President did not speak about that as he prefers to use more complicated concepts, he spoke about the tendency to relative reduction of the military might of the Atlantic alliance including the U.S. "Relative"--this means that the United States, as Carter considers and says, has still not lost this might and sees no immediate threat to this might.

[Zorin] The President himself said recently that there is no stronger country and that the Western alliance [words indistinct].

[Falin] ...For superiority. Pretensions...

[Zorin] The use of the fleet in peacetime too.

[Falin] Pretensions to a free hand for the United States where it considers this free hand acceptable and necessary for it. At present the Americans maintain armed forces in 114 states.

[Zagladin] And their messengers are now traveling round the world looking for somewhere to establish new bases.

[Falin] New bases, yes. Let me remind you that at the time of the establishment of the NATO aggressive bloc, the United States had armed forces stationed in only 39 states. Before the war American Armed Forces were stationed in only three states. At the same time as seeking new military bases on the territory of other countries, the President considers it essential, as he said in his speech, to create special floating bases in the shape of a fleet, in the shape of naval vessels which transport to regions--and not where a crises is taking place, but where the Americans expect a crisis to arise. It is very subtle this, to surmise where a crisis will arise--heavy weapons and equipment. Three American brigades are called American Marines and will be transported to this region by aircraft. It is planned to adopt other technical measures to insure that the quick-reaction corps mentioned before would have the military-technical means for interference in any region, even the most remote one from the United States.

And for what reason? Carter cites as an example the possibility of difficulties in the energy sphere. Or even more interesting--those connected with energy prices. Some West German public figures echo him in this case. Speaking recently to the Bundestag, Werner, the opposition representative, said that if the FRG wants to rely on a steady supply of raw materials and power in the coming years, it must show solidarity with the actions of the United States. Even so, I am not sure that when adopting the NATO decision, or in any case formulating the NATO decision, the allies were informed in detail of this broad plan announced by Carter on the very day after the communique was signed.

[Zagladin] Here is something that should be noted. Carter's somber 5-year plan shows quite clearly that the United States is full of resolve to do anything, anything it feels like doing, that in a sense it has a license to do anything. And after that and during this period and before--and it will probably continue--they will continue to say that the Soviet Union is destabilizing the situation.

They will say that the Soviet Union disturbs the balance of forces by giving aid to some state or other which is under pressure or even aggression from some imperialist forces and that it again disturbs the correlation of forces and provokes retaliatory actions by developing normal and natural measures for its defense. If one of our ships crosses some sea, they will raise an outcry about Soviet expansion, and meanwhile American emissaries travel in the same area from one country to another searching for a place to establish a new base or 2 or 3 or 10, which would be even better. It is hypocrisy, crass hypocrisy, as the old proverb says "to lay one's own fault at somebody else's door." However, it is not a case of proverbs. There is this calculation--a purely propaganda calculation--that this gross attempt, which is loud, which is noisy, and which is presented under big headlines with incessant broadcasts, speeches and statements, will succeed.

But I think that it should not succeed because the essence of Carter's policy, or rather of U.S. policy at the present stage, is coming increasingly apart in the United States itself and also abroad. And this is simply a natural continuation of a process which has already started there.

[Zorin] I would like to draw the attention of our viewers to another aspect. In the past 5 years [as heard] of President Carter's incumbency--a period which you have called somber--an annual increase in the Pentagon budget of 4.5 percent has been envisaged in real terms. This means that soon it will have to increase to 14 percent in real terms. At the same time the SALT II treaty, about which the same administration has said so much--as Valentin Mikhaylovich has already pointed out--is still held up in the Senate, and American observers, or at least some of them, now conclude that this discrepancy arises from several reasons and they cite several of them--one being the election campaign, the campaign in preparation for presidential elections, which has already begun in the United States. Carter must have taken this into account a few days ago when he spoke at the White House and summarized this program. The audience he selected is rather curious. And this was not accidental. He did not speak at a meeting of labor unions but invited 100 top leaders of banks and corporations and spoke to them about his views on increased military spending. This was not just another routine speech but an obvious turn in the administration's course. I would even say a regular turn. There have been more than two or three of them in the past 3 years. This one is connected inter alia with the beginning of the election campaign and an attempt by the head of the present administration to rely on rightist support.

In this connection I would like to mention a conversation which took place in November 1974. It so happened that I had occasion to be in Vladivostok after the talks between President Ford and Leonid Ilich Brezhnev. I asked Gerald Ford some questions and he assured us Soviet journalists that on his return to the United States he would lay aside all other business and occupy himself immediately in drawing up the agreement reached in Vladivostok. However, events proceeded otherwise. Both Ford and Kissinger returned from Vladivostok--an election campaign was beginning then, too--and showed that they did not keep their word by opting to rely on rightist circles during the election campaign. They put the Vladivostok agreement in cold storage. How this ended for President Ford is quite well-known. There is no doubt that with his program he pleased some circles, such as the military-industrial complex, but the voters saw it rather differently. Of course, it is difficult to say to what extent the pre-election considerations of this new election campaign contributed to President Carter's latest turn. There must be a certain amount of influence from them. But if this is so it would be useful to recall now the political lesson of the American voters' decision concerning the policy of former President Ford.

[Zagladin] Valentin Sergeyevich, here is a question. As you know, there is no 13th floor in some Western hotels. Would it not be a good idea to leave out of calendars the years when presidential elections are also held in the United States? Or something along those lines.

[Zorin] It would be a good idea, I think.

[Falin] It could be agreed that the 13th is omitted on the first Tuesday after the first Monday. [as heard]

[Zorin] I would like to mention one more problem in our talk today. Not only is this the last talk this year, but we are also on the eve of a new decade. The world is standing on the threshold of the eighties and it is natural to try and look forward and see what is in store. This is all the more so since the boundary between the seventies and eighties is marked by events arousing definite anxiety. Valdimir Valentinovich, how do you envisage the development of political processes during the eighties on the threshold of which we now stand?

[Zagladin] This is a difficult question because it is never easy to see ahead, and less so during our turbulent decades. However, I think that we have reason to view those processes optimistically. Why? Because there is a real basis for the development of international relations and for the development of the life lived by all of mankind in the correlation of forces--a correlation of forces not in the narrow sense such as missile against missile and tank against tank, but in a broad sense. And in the broad sense, the correlation of forces is primarily a socioeconomic term, a sociopolitical term and also a psychological term or, if you wish, a moral-psychological term. It is a term which encompasses the entire range of developments taking place in the world arena.

First there is the correlation of forces which stand for socialism, peace, democracy and national liberation as a whole, and the forces which stand for the opposite position. I think the seventies have left a good inheritance and the eighties must develop it strongly. The balance of the seventies is positive in this sense. Changes in the correlation of forces supporting socialism and peace and those opposing it have undoubtedly occurred and are occurring to the benefit of those who stand for peace. Further, there is the term which has an even broader sense--that of the correlation of the political forces which support the standpoint of commonsense and detente and the forces which take the positions of the cold war--let us call it by its proper name. I think that here too the correlation is very beneficial. After all, even the struggle surrounding the Brussels NATO session and its decision has shown the great potential of detente and the strength of its roots--the roots of commonsense, good will, confidence and the wish to speak from a position of confidence and to develop relations among countries from these standpoints.

Recently, during the last 2 months, several different forums--most diverse forums of public forces--have been held, where this could be verified tangibly, so to speak. For example, in early October, as our viewers know, we were visited by a delegation of the Socialist International. Of course, we hold different positions on many questions. The ideological positions are at present quite incompatible. But a common language was found in the sphere of detente and the sphere of peace. Later, at the end of October, an EEC forum devoted to disarmament was held in Belgium. Valentin Mikhaylovich and I were there and we saw for ourselves how people of quite different convictions--frequently quite opposed to each other on questions of ideology--all agreed that the concept of detente and negotiation must contribute to world progress. And yet there were quite different people there--from the honorary chairman of the Socialist International to the Mayor of Madrid and from Edgar Faure, the former French premier, to Canon (Horn), the Vatican representative. And so all these forces met and spoke as one.

[Falin] One of the proofs that detente cannot be ignored by NATO bloc leaders is the fact that the NATO Council session communique frequently mentions the wisdom of detente. There are assurances that the West is adopting the program of increasing arms only in the interest of detente. In short, they are bowing toward detente while the NATO decision is an act having nothing in common with detente. It seems that I may be repeating myself, but I would like to say that in life in general everything is either more complicated or more simple. Difficult times are ahead. It is becoming more difficult from the economic point of view for the West to live in grand style, but it has become used to living that way. When Carter speaks about economic difficulties, we must remember that it is said by the head of a country having 7 percent of the world's population, but which is consuming 20 percent or more of the world's energy resources. The question frequently arises as to whether the amount of energy consumed in the United States will be tolerated in the future. Maybe the world economic situation will demand a more just distribution.

[Zagladin] I think, Valentin Mikhaylovich, there can be no question of maybe. There is no doubt that world economies will enforce a more just distribution of energy. This is not just elementary justice, it is the reestablishment of justice violated a long time ago. But in general you are correct in saying that the West is at a dead end, in a very peculiar position, and I do not think that either the Brussels session or Carter's doctrine can provide a way out. The way out can be found by taking a different course. I would like to express my assurance that a way out will be found. It will be found as a result of thought, as a result of struggle, as a result of diplomatic actions on our part and on the part of all peace-loving states, parties, public figures and forces, because, as we have said--and it is a truth we are all devoted to--there is no alternative to detente and we cannot allow a world war. Since Carter himself acknowledges this, it must be true.

This year, in December, the West, as has now become a rule, adopted a new militaristic program for Christmas. For many years now, each December NATO session brings this kind of Christmas gift to the peoples of the West.

[Zorin] They do not make good Santa Clauses.

[Zagladin] No, they do not. Unless they are rather somber Santa Clauses. We have different rules and customs. We welcome the new year with decisions of our Supreme Soviet, which, as is known, not only did not increase our military budget, but on the contraty adopted a broad program of really peaceful creativity, a program implemented by all Soviet citizens. In fact, every Soviet citizen participated in its development. Therefore, I think we can look at 1980 and into the eighties with justified optimism. Although it is not yet 31 December, I think the time has come to greet our viewers on the coming new year and wish that 1980 will be happy for them, for our country and all our people. We have no doubt that it will be so. In conclusion, I would like to remember the words of a Soviet poet who was once quoted by Leonid Ilich: The century's wind blows into our sails.

[Zorin] All that is left for me is to thank those who participated in today's broadcast and you, our viewers, and wish you all the best for the coming year.

KURDYUMOV CALLS SHELVING OF SALT II 'DISQUIETING TURN'

LD071157 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jan 80 p 5 LD

[Nikolay Kurdyumov's "Commentator's Column": "Advantage Militarists"]

[Text] Washington--To the unconcealed jubilation of saboteurs of detente, rabid advocates of American military supremacy, the U.S. administration even more openly takes the course of reviving the policy of from the position of strength, of actual crossing out its own declaration on the striving for limitation of strategic armaments. [paragraph continues]

One of the latest manifestations of this tendency in policy is the White House-announced decision to postpone indefinitely the question of consideration of the SALT II treaty at the Senate.

In its attempt to justify this move in the eyes of the American and world public and to shrug off responsibility for the fate of the treaty, which, incidentally, accords with U.S. interests just as much as it does with USSR interests, Washington is resorting to references to the events in Afghanistan and to the Soviet Union's aid--which is not to Washington's taste--to the Afghan people in their repulse of foreign imperialist interference in their country's affairs.

It is no secret that U.S. procrastinations in the question of the treaty's ratification did not begin yesterday, and are linked, above all, with the fact that the saboteurs of SALT II have actually turned the treaty into a hostage of the military-industrial complex. Therefore, the announced decision was no surprise for American commentators who observed month by month the United States administration more and more obviously leading events to the satisfaction of ever growing appetites of the "hawks".

The testimony of this is the program of deploying the new system of strategic MX missiles which was adopted to please the militarists and which runs counter to the spirit of military detente, and the decision, very dangerous for the cause of peace, on expansion of the U.S. nuclear arsenal on the European Continent, is it not? In other words, instead of limitation of the arms race, Washington, ignoring the interests and aspirations of peoples, the realistic proposals of the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact member states, has taken a path of expansion of military preparations. J. Carter announced a long-term program of a sharp rise in the military budget and of speeding up the arms race.

According to the local press, President Carter's decision to actually shelve the SALT II treaty signifies a disquieting turn towards deterioration of the international atmosphere, freezing of Soviet-American relations, and signals projected serious changes in the country's foreign policy.

U.S. CONTENDS USSR HAS REJECTED TALKS ON MISSILES

LD071118 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0130 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Yevegniy Kachanov]

[Text] The U.S. State Department judging by a REUTER dispatch, has made a very strange statement. It says that the Soviet Union has allegedly turned down a NATO proposal to conduct talks on medium-range nuclear missiles deployed in Europe. The State Department is trying to protray this NATO proposal as a serious move in the direction of detente. But it is well known that it was the United States which via the NATO bloc has foisted the decision on the deployment of almost 600 new U.S. Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe on a number of West European countries. The whole world knows of the constructive and businesslike proposals of the Soviet Union in the sphere of military detente in Europe. But NATO headquarters, instead of paying heed to the voice of reason, has gone in for a further exacerbation of the arms race and thereby destroyed the basis for talks. This is why the State Department's statement represents nothing more than a clumsy attempt to put all the blame on someone else.

SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION ON AFGHANISTAN FAILS

Soviet Veto

LD081144 Moscow TASS in English 1135 GMT 8 Jan 80 LD

[Text] New York, January 8, TASS--The Security Council ended the discussion of the so-called "Afghan question" imposed against the will of the Government of Afghanistan by the United States, a number of countries supporting the U.S., and China. Unleashing a hostile campaign against Afghanistan and the Soviet Union, Washington did its utmost to involve the international community into its unsavory schemes. Many speakers in the debate gave a rebuff to these attempts.

The representative of the Laotian People's Democratic Republic, Boun Omme Southichak, said that the smear campaign, unleashed by the leading imperialist power, was designed to disguise its sinister plans of expansion and hegemony. It is precisely such plans that constitute a threat to universal peace and security. The speaker recalled the unprecedented programme of building up the American military potential--the deployment of medium-range missiles in Western Europe, the expansion of the network of war bases in Asia, in the Middle East, in Africa and Latin America.

Seeking to undermine the April revolution by any means, B. Dashtseren, the permanent representative of Mongolia at the United Nations, said, the Western countries and China subsidised the Afghan counter-revolutionaries and supplied arms to the gangsters entrenched in the Pakistani territory.

The attacks on the Soviet aid to Afghanistan, said Oleg Troyanovskiy, the permanent representative of the USSR at the United Nations, essentially are aimed at depriving the Afghan people of the right to determine themselves the ways and means of safeguarding their security. In practice this would mean to give a free hand to those forces that are pressing for the overthrow of the new order in Afghanistan.

The clamour, raised on the United States initiative in the United Nations around the so-called "Afghan question", is used as a pretext for justifying the policy of certain Western quarters that seek to revert the world to the "cold war" period. On this pretext the United States administration resolved to postpone ratification of the SALT II treaty. At the same time the United States is systematically pursuing the line of increasing its military expenditures, is intensifying military preparations in various regions of the world, especially in the Middle East and in the Indian Ocean.

The Soviet representative emphasized that an active part in the aggravation of the situation around Afghanistan is being played by the Chinese hegemonists, who also dislike the climate of detente and who more than once demonstrated their allegiance to the policy of expansionism. Afghanistan has become another target of the imperialists and hegemonists, said Ha Van Lau, the permanent representative of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam at the United Nations. Seeking to attain their political aims, imperialism and international reaction resort to such methods as the economic strangling of independent states, the whipping up of armed gangs from amidst counter-revolutionary scum for invasions and provocations against independent countries.

It is significant that no one in the Security Council debate could deny the obvious facts of armed intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan on the part of international imperialism and reaction.

No one could deny either that this intervention created a real threat of undermining the gains of the April revolution. It was precisely this threat that impelled the Afghan Government to ask for Soviet assistance on the basis of the treaty of friendship, good-neighbourhood and cooperation of 1978.

Speaking at the end of the meeting, Afghanistan's foreign minister, Shah Mohammad Dost, emphasized that the discussion of the "Afghan question" in the Security Council could not serve other purposes than a revival of the "cold war". Exposing the attempts at casting aspersions on the nature of the fraternal aid rendered by the Soviet Union to the Afghan revolution, the delegate of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan pointed out that this aid accorded with the interests and aspirations of the people of Afghanistan, whose independence, national sovereignty and territorial integrity were seriously threatened. The policy of Afghanistan, he said, is a policy of peace and friendship with all countries. We believe in the policy of peaceful coexistence, we also firmly believe that each people has the right to choose its own socio-political order without outside intervention.

The minister sharply rejected the draft resolution assessing it as undisguised intervention in the internal affairs of his country. The representatives of the USSR and the GDR, member countries of the Security Council, also opposed this draft which essentially meant a call for a change in the order existing in Afghanistan. The draft resolution was not adopted because the Soviet Union, a permanent member of the Security Council, voted against it.

Speeches Opposing Resolution

LD072132 Moscow TASS in English 2100 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

[Text] New York, January 7, TASS--Contrary to resolute protests of Afghanistan's Government the discussion of the so-called "Afghan issue," inspired by the United States, its allies and China, is continuing at the U.N. Security Council. In speeches of many delegates this discussion is rightfully characterized as unfounded and inadmissible interference into internal affairs of the sovereign U.N. member-country into questions, pertaining exclusively to the competence of the people and the Government of Afghanistan.

The convocation of the Security Council in connection with the far-fetched "Afghan issue" is the direct consequences of a series of subterfuges and downright pressure on the part of the United States and other imperialist reactionary forces, said Foreign Minister of Afghanistan Shah Mohammad Dost. It was inspired exclusively for diverting the attention of the world community from the real threat to Afghanistan from outside, and actually signifies interference into internal affairs of Afghanistan. We witness a downright departure from the established procedure of work of the Security Council, distortion of the meaning of the U.N. Charter and provisions of international law, he noted.

The USSR's Permanent Representative at the United Nations Oleg Troyanovskiy, speaking about the Soviet Union's aid to the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan which was rendered in reply to repeated requests of its government, has emphasized that the aim of that aid is exclusively to give assistance in repelling armed interference from outside. The Soviet Union sets no other aims to itself, it does not interfere into questions pertaining to the state and social system of Afghanistan, its home and foreign policy.

In conclusion, Oleg Troyanovskiy has said that the Soviet delegation categorically turns down any attempts to use the Security Council for interference into Afghanistan's internal affairs and into the sphere of bilateral Soviet-Afghan relations.

The GDR's Permanent Representative at the United Nations Peter Florin has described the hostile campaign unleashed against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan by imperialist and other reactionary forces, as a manifestation of the course of the opponents of detente aimed at aggravating the international tension. Washington's overt threats to use military force for armed interference in different parts of the world, he said, should make think the whole of the world community.

Bulgaria's delegate, Deputy Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of Bulgaria A. Tankov drew the Security Council's attention to the fact that Afghanistan became a target of a well-orchestrated subversive campaign exactly at a time when its government advanced a constructive programme of further development of the April revolution, consolidation of the socio-political foundations of the republic.

Pointing to the failure of the plans of imperialism to turn Afghanistan into a springboard for actions directed against the Soviet Union, Representative of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic Ilja Hulinsky has emphasized that the Soviet Union's internationalist aid is backed by all those who understand the aims of the April revolution, who are sincerely interested in safeguarding peace and international security.

The speech made by the U.S. representative at the United Nations, which abounded in slanderous attacks at the Soviet Union and its aid to Afghanistan, has demonstrated once again Washington's irritation because of the failure of its plans to turn that country into a strong point of the U.S. policy in the region.

CSSR, SRV Delegates' Speeches

LD072300 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

[Text] The discussion on the situation in Afghanistan continues in the UN Security Council. Our correspondent reports from New York: The Western countries are these days piling up slander after slander on the policy of the Soviet Union and Afghanistan. Special fervor is being manifested by the representatives of the United States and China, who have found a common language on a single antisocialist, antinational liberation basis.

The recent events in Afghanistan, said Ilja Hulinsky, permanent CSSR representative at the United Nations, have become the subject of crude attacks on the part of world reaction which is carrying out abuse with misinformation and misunderstanding. Today, when the plans for a counterrevolutionary coup in Afghanistan have failed, the enemies of progress are trying with all their strength to spread an anti-Afghan and antisocialist campaign. Its initiators are trying at the same time to distract the attention of the world public from its aggressive policy in the Near and Far East, and in other parts of the world, from the new cycle in the feverish arms race, and to hinder the bringing into effect of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on limitation of strategic arms, and in general to raise a wave of attacks against the stabilization of the process of international detente. The dangerous calculations of turning Afghanistan into a springboard against the Soviet Union have failed, the CSSR representative stressed.

The propagandist assertions of imperialist and hegemonist forces about the existence of some Soviet military threat in Asia are thoroughly false, the permanent representative of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Ha Van Lau, said in the Security Council. The real threat to peace and security in that area, noted the Vietnamese representative, is the subversive activity being conducted there by the United States in complicity with the expansionist authorities of Beijing.

Backing of U.S. Letter

LD041610 Moscow TASS in English 1540 GMT 4 Jan 80 LD

[Excerpt] Moscow, January 4, TASS--TASS commentator Yuriy Dashkov writes: According to reports from New York, the U.S. representative at the United Nations yesterday had to work a good deal to collect signatures to a letter with the proposal to convene the U.N. Security Council to discuss "the question of Afghanistan".

Who signed the letter? Those are mainly members of military blocs and alliances headed by the USA, and states which follow in the wake of Washington's policy. Among the signatories is also a representative of the fascist junta of Pinochet in Chile that came to power, as is known, after the overthrow with the help of U.S. special services of the legitimate government of Salvador Allende. On Washington's orders signatures were obligingly put by the delegates of the dictators of Haiti and Honduras which are supportedby the USA. The letter was also signed by a representative of China, the country which quite recently staged an open aggression against the neighboring state--Vietnam. Though Beijing formally is not a NATO member, it is not by chance called the 16th member of that aggressive military bloc. Washington managed to persuade a group of small states such as Papua New Guinea, Saint Lucia and Fiji into signing the letter.

USSR ABSTAINS FROM VOTING ON UN SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAN

NC081155 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1630 GMT 6 Jan 80 NC

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Dear listeners: These days Western bourgeois papers--while explaining the results of discussions on the differences between the U.S. and Iran at the UN Security Council session, called some time ago at the request of the U.S.--try to create obstacles in these discussions. For instance, U.S. papers--while referring to the fact that the United States is striving with all its strength to impose economic sanctions on Iran--nevertheless remain silent on the determination with which the Soviet Union, Czecholovakia and some other members of the Security Council abstained from supporting the resolution whose approval Washington was seeking. Kuwait's permanent UN representative, al-Bisharah, stressed in his speech that speaking of sanctions is tantamount to endangering peace and stability in the region. "Our delegation can in no way support a resolution which will practically intensify the crisis in an already extremely dangerous and explosive situation." Al-Bisharah stated that results cannot be obtained through sanctions.

Soviet Permanent UN Representative Oleg Aleksandr ovich Troyanovskiy, in a speech at the UN Security Council, said that to impose sanctions (?in order to solve) U.S.-Iranian differences is a completely baseless a[illegible]. The Soviet representative then said: "The imposition of sanctions and the implementation of (?forcible) acts against Iran will only make the situation more sinister and create a threat to peace. Restraint and composure should be shown in this case." Oleg Troyanovskiy expressed his firm belief that it is necessary and possible to solve the problem peacefully. The Soviet representative said: "If the Security Council choses any other alternative, it will intensify the crisis, not diminish it; it will make it more difficult to solve the problem peacefully--an objective toward which it should strive." The representatives of Czechoslovakia and Bangladesh stressed the same points in their speeches. The debates at the Security Council showed, on the whole, that many of its members reject the imposing of sanctions on Iran being sought by Washington.

COMMENTARY ON U.S. REACTION TO AFGHAN EVENTS

Svetlov Article

LD071101 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jan 80 p 4 LD

[V. Svetlov article: "Duplicity of Imperialist Propaganda"]

[Text] With the White House's active participation U.S. propaganda is unfolding a campaign of hostility to the Soviet Union around events in Afghanistan. In doing so it is not even stopping at juggling with and distorting facts and even at direct forgeries.

When slander acquires such a massive and provocatory form, the question naturally arises as to why this is being done. Washington knew what it was embarking on in its incitement and direction of the aggressive actions of anti-Afghan forces, its implementation of ever more unbridled interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan and its conscious raising of tension to the extreme limit. But now it is bearing malice and covering up its traces.

The leaders of the U.S. administration are now talking of a possible adoption of "retaliatory measures" and of their intention to carry out "the commitments" which the United States has in this area. Z. Brzezinski, the U.S. presidential adviser on national security affairs, says that the United States has in particular commitments to insure the security of Pakistan and is ready to take appropriate measures--including military force--in order "to insure peace and stability in the Middle East."

It is not made clear who is threatening Pakistan and in what way. There is a reason for this, for no sane person would undertake to prove that Afghan territory is being used for interference in the internal affairs of Pakistan and not the other way round. On the other hand the evidence of aggressive activity against Afghanistan from Pakistan's territory is irrefutable. However, in Mr Brzezinski's awareness, facts of this kind are represented as "positive ones" which need to be multiplied. The fact that these actions cause grief and death to people is a detail which can be ignored in certain U.S. "higher interests," as they are defined by Brzezinski.

But how is one to treat the obligations and interests of other countries? Following a strange logic in Washington they loudly proclaim that the interests and rights of all others are below those of America and are only worth taking into account to the extent to which it is beneficial to the United States. If such a thing is said seriously and not in the heat of the period prior to the election, then it must be asked: How responsible are the U.S. ruling circles in their approach to the problems of maintaining peace, and how seriously can one take their declarations of intentions to cooperate in this matter with other states, which are not about to adapt themselves to U.S. views.

Peace will never come out winner from attempts to approach an evaluation of what is going on with a double standard. Today the stability of peace and its future to an even greater extent than ever before are based on reciprocity.

In the name of what did the half-a-million strong U.S. Army commit barbarous crimes in Indochina? President Carter now admits that it was an overt "military intervention in the domestic affairs of another country, when our (U.S.) own vital interests with regard to security were not directly affected." [paragraph continues]

An overdue admission which has been paid for with the lives of millions of Vietnamese and Kampucheans and many tens of thousands of Americans themselves. International as well as American public has protested at Washington's arbitrariness. How did certain Western countries behave? They either kept quiet or said "yes" to it out of "solidarity," seeing that international peace and the rights of other peoples were flouted by their "friend" and "patron."

The U.S. President has admitted that until the overthrow of the shah the Americans had their armed forces on the territory of Iran. Armed forces, not amorphous "specialists" and "advisers." A great part of these troops was moreover deployed immediately along the Soviet border.

Carter said nothing about how many of these seekers of "American security" there were on foreign borders. We can help him: At various times they numbered up to 40,000. This, like the coup carried out by the CIA in Iran in 1953 which prolonged the shah's arbitrary rule by a quarter of a century and much, much else, is seen in Washington and certain Western and Eastern capitals as a "natural" thing.

In that sense there is no problem for imperialist propaganda and its "yes-man" in Beijing. The transfer from one end of the earth to the other of tens of thousands of soldiers, hundreds of aircraft and dozens of ships is extolled by them as an act which protects tranquility and peace. But the troops and weapons have to be American. When it is a question of a limited military contingent being sent in response to repeated requests by the Government of Afghanistan for support in its struggle against the forces of aggression, then it is an "invasion" because it is a Soviet contingent. If it had been American, this would have been "help." If they had succeeded in their intention to turn Afghanistan into an image of the shah's Iran, that would have been proclaimed as manna from heaven.

The U.S. leaders and their minions have stopped at nothing in their attempts to turn back the developments in Afghanistan and bring down the regime which came to power as a result of the April revolution. U.S. "specialists" selected, paid and armed bands of counterrevolutionaries dispatched into the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Representatives of official Washington discussed with their heads in the State Department plans and dates for antigovernmental revolts and manifestations. Professional experts in subversive activities, having left behind them a bad reputation in the countries of the Near East, concentrated in the U.S. Embassy in Kabul and, following their expulsion from here, in neighboring Pakistan from where they directed and continue to direct the struggle against the legal Government of Afghanistan. With full justification the Japanese paper AKAHATA noted that the actions of the antigovernment forces based on the territory of Pakistan relied upon U.S. aid and were directed by the CIA. These are not isolated facts but rather a planned system of measures to stifle the Afghan revolution, destroying its roots with the aid of agents like Amin and destabilize the situation in the region as a whole.

On New Year's Eve President Carter proclaimed the renewed doctrine of bellicose hegemonism. According to the designs of Washington, the pillars in the implementation of this doctrine are to be Pakistan, Israel, Egypt, Somalia and certain other Arab countries. Washington would like very much to add Afghanistan to them too.

I have already noted the claims of the U.S. ruling circles which cannot be called anything other that great-power. But then why are there to be found those who wish to assist them? What is it that is guiding Pakistan first and foremost which is allowing itself to be drawn into a highly dangerous imperialist combination?

It is via the territory of Pakistan that comes the main flow of weaponry and mercenaries used by the imperialists in the struggle against Democratic Afghanistan. It is in Pakistan that one finds the main bases of anti-Afghan reaction, which is striving to drown the popular revolution of Afghanistan in blood and to transform this country into a bridgehead for hostile activities against the USSR.

The attention of the government of Islamabad has been drawn many times to the impermissibility of the situation which is coming about and to the aggressive nature of the intrigues of the forces which have found refuge in Pakistan.

The Pakistani leadership could long ago have taken measures which would without delay have brought a normalization of the situation on the border with Afghanistan to Pakistan itself. But this was not done. Afghanistan officially confirmed in connection with the latest events its desire and readiness to maintain and develop friendly relations with all its neighbors. The Afghan leadership declared that it had not the slightest design aimed against the interests of neighboring states. Moreover, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan counts, for its part, that its neighbors will renounce interference in the internal affairs of the Afghan people. It is not too late even now for a constructive response to this appeal and then the causes which prompted Afghanistan's need to turn to the USSR for military aid would cease to exist.

By all accounts, stability and calm in the Middle East suit the U.S. administration least of all. These ideas do not enter into the present U.S. foreign policy concepts. That is why the United States is pushing Pakistan down the road of antagonism and attempting to entangle it with obligations which will lead to the resurrection of the spirit of CENTO. It is for this purpose that the decision has been announced in Washington to send Pakistan the latest types of weapons, including missiles, totaling $100 million. A hefty contribution to the further militarization of the Indian Ocean area.

The Indian Information Agency reports that no basis is seen in Delhi for the U.S. decision to send new arms deliveries to Pakistan, especially as the Afghan Government has clearly announced its wish to establish good-neighborly relations with all adjacent countries, one of which is Pakistan.

American propaganda is spreading stupid inventions about a threat that is allegedly aimed at Iran from the USSR. Washington officials go even so far as to claim that the Soviet Union is preparing for aggression against that country. This claim is made by those who are not just bullying the present Iranian leadership but who are purposefully accumulating armed forces in order to strike at Iran that "crushing" blow of which some American military people are speaking without beating about the bush. It is truly difficult to find a more striking example of hypocrisy.

The Soviet Union opposes resolutely and on principle interference in the internal affairs of states, under whatever pretext it is prepared and carried out. Imperialist arbitrariness under the mask of "protecting interests," "preventing negative developments" and so on must not be allowed to become once again the practice of international life as it was in the 1940's and 1950's.

The Soviet military aid to Afghanistan has no other aims than helping a friendly country to exercise its right to individual and collective self-defense in warding off external imperialist aggression. The limited contingent of Soviet troops sent to Afghanistan will be fully withdrawn as soon as the reason for its being sent no longer exists, i.e., as soon as external imperialist interference in the affairs of Afghanistan ceases and its people can make full use of the possibilities for building their life according to their own choice.

Zhukov Viewpoint

LD071339 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jan 80 p 4 LD

[Yuriy Zhukov "International Review"]

[Text] The first working week of the new year and of the new decade is coming to an end. With cheerful hearts we said goodbye to the 1970's which will go down in history as a period of persistent and successful struggle by the Soviet Union, the fraternal socialist countries and all the peace-loving peoples of the world to maintain and consolidate peace, the relaxation of tension and mutually advantageous international cooperation.

Ahead lies the 1980's, which can and must be marked by new successes along that path. That is what our party and government called for in the new year address to the people.

Soviet people are fully determined to increase their efforts two-fold, three-fold and ten-fold in the struggle for peace and security, so as to prevent the forces of war and aggression--which are now stepping up their activity--from reversing the predominantly favorable development of the international situation which characterized the 1970's.

The Peace Program and the Doctrine of Aggression

No matter how much the hired propagandists of the world bourgeoisie go on about the imaginary "Soviet threat," the Soviet Union has been, is and will always be a staunch and persistent fighter for peace.

The peace program adopted by our party's 24th congress and supplemented by the 25th congress is being implemented successfully, step by step, year after year by our state with the support of all peace-loving countries and peoples.

This program is opposed by the doctrine which is now being followed by the imperialist states under U.S. command and which is standing out increasingly clearly--a doctrine of dangerous political-military adventures, of the arms race and of stepping up tension. The United States, as events show, is turning the helm increasingly sharply away from the line in international relations which was elaborated by common consent and enshrined in a whole series of international and bilateral agreements in the first half of the 1970's.

Clear evidence of this is provided by the long-term program for stepping up the arms race adopted by the NATO Council under U.S. diktat, the recent decision on deploying new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe, the detailed program for military hegemonism proclaimed by President Carter which provides for the further stepping up of U.S. armaments on a hitherto unprecedented scale and the resurrection of the cynical idea of U.S. world dominance under the flag of defending that country's "national interests," which, as those who preach this idea assert, extend throughout the globe.

This doctrine of American hegemonism was expressed most frankly and cynically in President Carter's television speech on the evening of 4 January (0500 hours on 5 January Moscow time) and in the accompanying "explanations" which his advisers then gave to journalists.

Bringing to fever pitch the war hysteria which is being artificially fanned in the United States around events in Afghanistan, President Carter again brought into play the rusty weapon of intimidation and blackmail which the United States has used so many times in the past against the land of the soviets--and always unsuccessfully!

Acting in fact in violation of agreements concluded in the 1970's between the United States and the USSR which played a part of considerable importance in the development and consolidation of detente and mutually advantageous businesslike cooperation, Carter announced his decision to postpone indefinitely the examination in the Senate of the SALT II treaty, to end or reduce exports of American goods to the USSR--including goods for which agreements on deliveries have already been concluded, to cancel a whole series of talks formerly planned on the most diverse aspects of Soviet-American relations, to postpone most of the planned cultural exchanges and so forth.

The Washington administration is not disturbed by the very real fact that this policy can only serve to further complicate economic development for the United States and its allies which is already weakened by a series of severe crises. The American dollar is hurtling toward disaster, the burdens on the working people are growing and the edifice of the capitalist economy is cracking like a ramshackle shed in the wind.

Nor was Carter capable of concealing this in his bellicose speech. He admitted that the measures outlined--which provide for the breaking of mutually advantageous economic ties with the USSR--"will demand certain sacrifices from all Americans." But that obviously does not disturb him. For him, apparently, the concerns of the American workers who will lose their jobs because of the refusal to fulfill Soviet orders and the farmers who will be deprived of a market for the fruits of their labor are of no significance. For him it is more important to try once again to insure superiority in strength over the noncapitalist world at any price so as to gain an opportunity for dictating his will.

This speech by the American President is simply astounding: Has Washington really completely forgotten the lessons of history? If the policy of threats and blackmail with respect to the land of the soviets invariably failed in past times when imperialism was immeasurably stronger, what can the politicians be counting on when they try to revive these methods in international relations now that the world is different and when it is clear to everyone that the dream of American hegemony over the world has no real chance of coming true?

Washington Seeks New Allies

Attempts have recently been made in Washington to find new allies who could be relied on in the implementation of an aggressive line. Much is being written and said to the effect that it is time to involve Japan in the system of anti-Soviet military blocs. The American political scientist R. Cline proposed the creation of an "ocean alliance" with 12 links--the United States, Canada, Britain, the FRG, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Israel, Japan, Taiwan, Australia and New Zealand.

In connection with the visit by U.S. Defense Secretary Harold Brown to Beijing which has begun, the question of establishing mutual relations of security between the United States and China is being openly examined. On this issue the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR stated on 4 January that this "planned military alliance could be the most important global change in the 1980's."

On the same day D. Middleton, New York TIMES military observer, reported that "a certain high-ranking official" hinted that "Brown may possibly discuss the question of military aid" to China which, incidentally, would not work out cheaply for Beijing: "from $61 billion to $63 billion"!

Meanwhile the American "hawks" are increasingly stepping up their interference in the affairs of states which are unwilling to submit to U.S. diktat.

With a persistence worthy of a better cause, Washington is gambling, as before, on knocking together obedient and bloody dictatorial regimes everywhere, which would use terror as a force to keep the peoples in a state of submission. The American leaders who are so fond of talking about human rights, are in no way disturbed by the fact that their henchmen are butchers and murderers who do not shrink from mass killings. Any dictator who oppresses the people suits the United States as long as he heeds instructions from Washington and allows his patrons to lord it in the country with impunity.

But the force of the revolutionary spirit and the will for freedom and independence is stronger than any weapons. That is why despite all the military aid they are given by the United States, these bloody dictators are losing control one after another and either fleeing ignominiously or paying with their skin for the crimes they have committed. Then Washington begins to howl that "legality has been violated," and, of course, that this has happened "through Moscow's fault." Then the subversive activity begins against the really legitimate activity set up by the liberated people as is happening now with respect to Afghanistan.

The Afghan People's Just Cause Will Be Victorious!

On 1 January the Afghan people's democratic forces marked the 15th anniversary of their People's Democratic Party which was born underground, was tempered in the heroic struggle against the feudal regime and headed the victorious national democratic revolution in April 1978.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan [DRA], which was created as a result of that activity, embarked on a path of building a new society based on the principles of social progress and justice. But from the first steps, as always happens when a victorious people begin to break up the old, obsolete system and to create a new one, they came up against a two-fold threat: from internal reaction and foreign aggression.

Outside aggression was a real danger in current conditions in Afghanistan. As has been irrefutably proved, gangs formed abroad--which try to disorganize the new system in Afghanistan and which subject the population to terror and intimidation--are being armed and trained by American, Chinese and other foreign instructors. They operate by the most savage methods. Matters have gone so far that the bandits have cut off the hands of children attending schools opened by the Democratic Government of Afghanistan.

At the same time CIA agents were carrying out subversive activity in the state apparatus. The situation was particularly exacerbated when Amin, having become a member of the Afghan Government, betrayed the cause of the revolution, entered into collusion with the enemies, overthrew and physically annihilated Taraki--the party's founder and president of the republic--seized power and embarked on a path of mass terror.

Fortunately there were courageous people in the party and the country, people devoted to the cause of the revolution, who put an end to this tyranny in the last few days of December. Babrak Karmal, who has been elected general secretary of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan Central Committee, chairman of the Revolutionary Council and prime minister of the DRA, has proclaimed and taken the lead in a resolute struggle to implement the lofty aims for whose sake the April revolution of 1978 was carried out.

This news literally threw off balance those who were entertaining far-reaching plans for seizing Afghanistan and turning it into a bridgehead for anti-Soviet and anti-Iranian actions. Now dangerous new adventures are beginning.

It has already been announced that the United States has decided to give Pakistan immediate military aid, which beyond all doubt will be used for armed formations attacking Afghanistan. The foreign press writes openly that during his visit to China Brown intends to persuade the Beijing leaders to step up still further their aid to the military formations being sent into Afghanistan for the struggle against the legitimate government.

On 3 January the New York TIMES, recalling that China is already "supplying firearms to formations waging war on Afghan territory," called on the Beijing leaders to step up deliveries of weapons to the Afghan people's enemies.

In these conditions all the more significance is attached to the Soviet Union's consenting to satisfy the DRA Government's repeated request for a limited Soviet military contingent to be sent to Afghanistan, which will be used exclusively to help rebuff armed interference from outside. No matter how much Washington now spins the flywheel of slanderous propaganda, it must be clear to everyone that the Soviet Union will not leave our Afghan friends in trouble and will not renege on the commitments dictated both by the Soviet-Afghan treaty on friendship, good neighborliness and cooperation and by the UN Charter which grants states the right to collective and individual self-defense with a view to rebuffing aggression and restoring peace.

If the United States respects the UN Charter, which it maintains it does, then it could help to fulfill that task on its own part. For instance, Washington could stop equipping and training armed formations which are sent into Afghanistan from Pakistani territory and could order its "wards" to stop invading DRA territory. However, somehow it does not look as if Washington is prepared to act in that way. On the contrary, war hysteria is being stepped up there.

Meanwhile the Pentagon is preparing on the sly for the seizure of bridgeheads in the region of the Near and Middle East and for the creation of new naval and air force bases and is concentrating military forces. Unconcealed threats are being issued to countries which refuse to submit to American diktat.

What can be said about this? These belligerent gentlemen must be reminded again and again that if such a policy failed to win laurels for the United States in the 1950's and it had to renounce it, now that the correlation of forces in the world has changed substantially they ought to guard against returning to the old formulas.

Even in the present situation our policy line remains unchanged. "The USSR, the socialist countries and all the world's peace-loving forces," the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On the 110th Anniversary of Vladimir Ilich Lenin's Birth" says, "fight persistently to insure that detente remains the leading trend in international relations." That is where we stand and nobody will succeed in shifting us from that stance.

On entering the eighth decade of the 20th century the Soviet Union will continue to implement a firm, principled policy in the struggle to consolidate peace, against the intrigues of the forces of aggression and war and for the consistent strengthening of the indestructible alliance of today's leading forces--socialism, the international communist and workers' movement and the peoples' national leberation struggle. The events now unfolding in Afghanistan and around it again convincingly confirm the importance of consolidating that alliance.

REACTION, COMMENT TO CARTER'S SPEECH ON AFGHAN EVENTS

LD061440 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 6 Jan 80 LD

[From the "International Diary" program, presented by Gennadiy Ariyevich]

[Text] President Carter of the United States appealed on television to the country in connection with--as he put it--the extraordinarily important situation in Southwest Asia. He strived to create the false impression that the USSR, in giving aid to Afghanistan, was pursuing some aim other than lending support to the rebuff to foreign aggression that is taking place with the direct participation of the United States and China. Instead of calling a halt to it the President announced the granting of big allocations to Pakistan, for the purpose of encouraging incursions into Afghanistan from abroad. The fabrication about the aggressive action of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan was utilized by Carter as a pretext for taking a number of unilateral measures directed at a curtailment of commercial, economic, scientific and cultural relations with the USSR. These measures are obviously borrowed from the cold war arsenal. They constitute a gross violation by the United States of its obligations and confirm that a positive development of Soviet-American cooperation is not in the interests of the present Washington administration.

In his speech Carter also presented the American administration version of events in Iran. In his words the aim of the United States with regard to events in Iran is only to protect its long-term interests and to achieve the liberation of American hostages. At that, Carter preferred to maintain silence on the deployment of large U.S. naval forces in the immediate vicinity of the Iranian shores of the Persian Gulf and in the Indian Ocean. The President advanced the thoroughly false thesis that Iran is allegedly threatened by the Soviet Union. This is evidence of the obvious striving by the American administration to divert public attention from thepolicy of clear and heavyhanded pressure on Iran by the United States.

Spirit of Cold War

LD071412 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

[Text] The statement issued by the Soviet news agency TASS following President Carter's speech on American television has attracted the attention of the world public. Our observer Viktor Glazunov makes these remarks: [read by announcer]

President Carter's speech was worded in the spirit and phraseology of the cold war. It seemed as if the shadow of John Foster Dulles had materialized to speak in Washington. As TASS pointed out in its statement, the content of that speech and the steps announced by the American administration in the sphere of Soviet-American relations can only be described as hostile to the interests of peace.

As a major power the United States shoulders great responsibility for the maintenance of peace and the development of international cooperation. What the American President said and plans to do, however, can in no way be reconciled with this responsibility. Is it in the interests of peace and cooperation to galvanize the circles that have long been waging a war against an easing of tensions? Yet this is what Washington has been doing by harping on the so-called Afghan question. Or take the American policy of pressure and blackmail against Iran--a policy that also serves to promote the interests of the most bellicose circles in the United States.

If President Carter chose to say nothing about European affairs in his speech, his failure to do so was just as eloquent, because by saddling NATO with its plan for deploying new systems of nuclear missiles in West Europe, Washington has placed a mine under the edifice of international relaxation in Europe.

The measures for curtailing Soviet-American contacts outlined in Carter's speech show disregard for the vital long-term interests of peace and lesser tension. If this is Washington's idea of punishing the Soviet Union, it should remember that contacts are a reciprocal matter. Farmers in the United States have already given it to understand that they regard the President's decision to cut back grain exports as the heaviest blow to their interests since the crisis of the thirties. This is one aspect of the matter and the question that should be asked in this connection is: Does Washington really think that it can influence Soviet foreign policy by withholding some supplies to this country? Could it be that some groups have learned nothing from past experience? It is a hopeless venture to speak a language of pressure and threats with the Soviet Union. Officials in Washington seem to have lost political balance. They seem to be incapable of making a realistic assessment of the international situation, given their tendency to overestimate the possibilities of their own country and to underestimate the possibilities of others. This is a dangerous line in politics.

The Soviet Union could always stand its ground. No one should doubt that today, too, it will be able to defend its legitimate interests and the interests of its allies and friends. Those who would like to ignore this run the risk of tripping up (?in politics).

There are signs that American foreign policy is taking a dangerous path. One would like to hope that a realistic and farsighted approach will nevertheless prevail in the long run. The realities of our times demand precisely such an approach, because it has no rational alternative.

Other Reaction to Measures

LD071920 Moscow TASS in English 1854 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, January 7, TASS--Correspondents report:

New York--The discriminatory measures announced by U.S. President Carter in the field of Soviet-American relations as well as the decision to postpone discussion in the Senate of the SALT II treaty caused sharp criticism in the United States.

The steps which President Carter has decided to take, writes newspaper NEWSDAY in its editorial article, will prejudice, above all, U.S. interest. Thus, the delay in ratifying SALT II will entail increased military spending by the United States, call into question the credibility of the U.S. administration. As to the U.S. balance of payments, it will be affected by the reduction in the volume of trade with the USSR. Secretary of the movement of agricultural workers of South Dakota D. Harrison has described this decision by J. Carter as unjust. In her words, the decision is directed, above all, against rank-and-file U.S. farmers.

According to former U.S. Secretary of Commerce F. Wale, the Soviet Union can simply neglect the consequences of these restrictions. Anything covered by the restrictions can be purchased from other countries, while our allies follow the principle of "business is business and politics are politics," he said.

The "tough" statements by President J. Carter are directly linked here to the Presidential campaign which is unfolding in the country. During the time Carter has been in the White House the rate of inflation in the United States have almost doubled, the energy crisis exacerbated, the real incomes of Americans have sharply declined, and the country has entered a new deep economic recession characterised by a curtailment of production and growing unemployment. J. Carter has failed to honour many of his campaign commitments to resolve these problems, says newspaper WALL STREET JOURNAL. Developing this idea, the newspaper Boston GLOBE notes that President J. Carter is trying to make up for his weak stand inside the country by bellicosity abroad.

Paris--French Foreign Minister Jean Francois-Poncet has said in an interview broadcast by Radio Europe No 1 broadcasting station, among others, the following: Unlike the United States, France will not change the nature of its economic relations with the Soviet Union. France maintains with the USSR economic relations not conditioned by any political considerations. The French Government has always considered it important to pursue a dialogue with the Soviet Union.

To preserve the process of detente, which is in the interests of all states, it is necessary that one should carefully and coolheadedly ponder one's decisions, J. Francois-Poncet said. Levity can only lead us to eliminting all the achievements of the policy of detente. The likely consequences of this course are quite self-evident.

U.S. CANNOT HIDE RESPONSIBILITY FOR SUBVERSION IN ASIA

LD051948 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 5 Jan 80 LD

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Yevgeniy Petko]

[Text] We have asked our correspondent in New York, Vladimir Gerasichev, to comment on the actions of the United States: On the last day the Security Council adopted a decision which expressed serious concern over the growing tension in relations between the United States and Iran. It should be noted that the Soviet Union and a number of other countries--including Kuwait, Bangladesh and Czechoslovakia--abstained from voting on this resolution. The point is that the United States, deliberately exaggerating the significance of this bilateral conflict, is seeking to push through the Security Council a decision on the adoption of so-called economic sanctions against Iran which would envisage the ending of international trade with that country.

[Petko] In this connection our radio listeners would probably be interested to hear about the Soviet Union's stand on this question in greater detail.

[Gerasichev] Comrade Troyanovskiy, the permanent representative of the Soviet Union at the United Nations, has stated that those who assert that international peace and security are threatened as a result of Iran's actions are incorrect. Attempts to represent things in this light distort the real state of affairs and are not keeping with the spirit and content of the Security Council resolution of 4 December of last year.

The permanent representative of the Soviet Union at the United Nations particularly stressed the fact that what is happening between the United States and Iran is a two-sided argument and that this is why there is no justification in linking the question of some kind of sanctions to this argument. The use of sanctions or the use of any physical actions against Iran can only aggravate the situation and present a threat to peace. The Soviet Union proceeds from the fact that it is not only necessary but also possible to solve this problem by peaceful means.

[Petko] It should be noted that the anti-Iranian campaign which is being inflated by the U.S. Government has been supplemented by two others--an inti-Afghan and an anti-Soviet campaign. Clear testimony to this is the television broadcast made by U.S. President Carter. Judging from all appearances, he again made use, as he did last year, of the propaganda smokescreen concerning the mythical presence of Soviet combat units in Cuba. Once again the proteges of the U.S. military-industrial complex are trying, in their election fever, verbally to underpin the steps that are being taken to the right in international politics.

However, this approach--which everyone knows to be a circus trick--is bringing in ever-fewer takings. Everything possible is being done here in order to discredit the actions of the Soviet Union in granting aid to the neighboring Afghan people before the American and international public.

Washington is making out that it allegedly has no connections with the fact that, under the guidance of Central Intelligence Agency instructors, counterrevolutionary gangs armed with Chinese weapons were and are being trained and infiltrated into Afghanistan from Pakistani territory.

It is being noted here, however, that it is unlikely Washington will manage to conceal its responsibility for its subversive activities in the countries of the east this time.

WASHINGTON QUEST FOR NEW BASES SHARPLY CRITICIZED

'Big Lie' Technique

LD041500 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 4 Jan 80 LD

[Vladyslav Kozyakov commentary]

[Text] Many times in recent history the American public was misled by the United States policy makers. The big lie about a threat to America and the threat to peace was used to involve the country in military intervention and local wars in various parts of the world. In Korea and Vietnam alone more than 80,000 Americans were killed and hundreds of thousands were injured.

Now history seems to repeat itself. Again a United States President is trying to assure the public that the national interests are in danger and American troops and armaments should be sent to other countries. Again the old big lie is being used to mislead the American public. President Carter says that the Soviet Union's aid to the Government of Afghanistan, granted at its request, is a grave threat to peace. But what about the administration's official doctrine of armed interference in many foreign countries wherever United States interests are in danger? The doctrine was proclaimed in Washington before the Soviet Union's decision to meet the Afghan Government's request for military aid.

On 16th December President Carter stated at a meeting with pressmen of the [word indistinct] company that a strong America, prepared (?for force) if necessary, was an integral aspect of the country's spirit and of the role it has by right to play.

What is most indicative is that the doctrine of armed interference in other countries' domestic affairs, of defending America's interests abroad, was not only proclaimed by the administration--it is being implemented. The official program provides for the spending of 1 trillion dollars on the arms race in the next 5 years, appropriating [as heard] a quick deployment military force. Here is what Defense Secretary Harold Brown said about the force: It's a trouble-shooting unit that will be airlifted quickly to any part of the world and set up combat equipment from ships stationed in friendly harbors. Needless to say that this American force is being created not for purely sightseeing but for the purpose of United States military interference in other countries' internal affairs.

Along with the creation of a quick deployment military force the Pentagon is seeking new military bases abroad, mostly in the Indian Ocean region. As the New York TIMES put it: The bases will be stage posts for American intervention to defend United States interests. Finally, as [words indistinct] asks: Who gives the right to the United States administration to threaten other sovereign nations with American military intervention by building a quick deployment military force; who gives the Pentagon the right to concentrate huge military forces in the Arabian Sea and the Persian Gulf and who gives the CIA the right to train armed thugs in Pakistan and send them to Afghanistan to struggle against that country's government?

The leaders of the administration in Washington are now expressing their satisfaction with the fact that the so-called Vietnam syndrome doesn't exist any longer in the United States. Zbigniew Brzezinski said that the country had got rid of post-Vietnam war caution in its approach to military spending and to possible interference abroad. In other words the Washington policy makers seem to regard it as possible to resume all the tactics of fooling the American public by using big lies for the purpose of involving the country in new dangerous military adventures abroad.

Dmitriyev Commentary

LD071310 Moscow World Service in English 0900 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

[Text] We bring you a comment by our observer Igor Dmitriyev. He takes a look at such seemingly isolated events as a nuclear explosion over South Africa, the Somali Red Sea port of Berbera and the events in Afghanistan.

Several years ago one of the hottest items in the U.S. mass media were alleged Soviet attempts to build a modern naval facility in the Somali port of Berbera. The campaign lasted for months. However, a group of U.S. officials who visited the place did not discover any Soviet base. It was the time when Washington was modernizing its Diego Garcia base in the Indian Ocean and needed some justification for that. It has become known that the United States seeks to establish a new stronghold in the area and it is the Berbera port.

[Words indistinct] South Africa (?was) detected by an American satellite several (?versions) have been circulated in America. A very popular one, prompted by South Africa itself, was that an explosion was a result of some accident invlolving a Soviet submarine. Another story had it that the blast was caused by a Soviet missile launched to Antarctica in 1963. The warhead did not explode at that time, but 16 years later, after the fuses had been eaten off by rust, the warhead went off. The stories are as good as any if the idea is to cover up cooperation between NATO and South Africa in nuclear technology.

The U.S. administration had denied any involvement in outside subversion against Afghanistan. If it is so, what did Afghan rebel leaders do in Washington? As a matter of fact, they are U.S. citizens, but their visit was hardly a sightseeing tour.

If nobody assists rebels, what do Americans and Chinese do at rebel bases in Pakistan and who armed them? And [words indistinct] Pakistan had explained that they are [words indistinct] assisting the subversive elements under pressure from Washington.

As none of these questions has been clearly answered so far by the United States, one can assume that they are [words indistinct]. The three events which have been mentioned took place in different regions and at different times, but the thing they have in common is the technique of deception when the Soviet Union has been (?lacked in) as a culprit to cover up American indiscretion, to put it mildly. This fact-twisting has [words indistinct] by Western control of the means of communication.

Orlov in IZVESTIYA

LD080953 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Jan 80 Morning Edition p 5 LD

[Article by TASS political observer I. Orlov: "The History of a Certain Lesson"]

[Text] In the light of the latest series of anti-Soviet fabrications currently doing the rounds of the bourgeois press with a view to portraying a "Soviet threat" in first one and then another part of the world, it is useful to recall the history of one such fabrication--the so-called "Soviet military base" in Berbera (Somalia).

A big fuss was kicked up around this fabrication in Washington a few years ago. Then Defense Secretary J. Schlesinger alleged that there was a Soviet military base in Somalia.

And although at the time the Soviet Union stated clearly and unequivocally that, unlike the United States, it does not keep military bases on other people's territory and does not seek to acquire such bases, the U.S. press--with active support from the administration--intensively magnified the myth of a "Soviet military threat" in this region.

A few years passed, and what did the reality turn out to be? It turned out that, under cover of a deliberately orchestrated propaganda campaign--a unique kind of smokescreen--the Pentagon was taking real steps to consolidate its positions and station its own naval forces in this region. Assistant Secretary of State R. Moose went to Mogadishu in the capacity of personal representative of the U.S. President and held talks on American arms supplies and the possibility of creating a military-political alliance of pro-Western countries in the Red Sea area. The most recent action undertaken by Washington in this direction is a visit by a high-ranking military-political delegation which has had discussions in a number of countries on the question of new American military bridgeheads, including the utilization of Berbera as a base for the American Navy. These forces are intended to operate in conjunction with the recently formed "quick reaction corps" against Islamic peoples, and primarily the people of Iran. The hasty attempts to link the plans for Washington to acquire new military bridgeheads with the recent events in Afghanistan will hardly convince anybody. For it is well known that the plans to create a U.S. military base at Berbera were conceived a long time ago and that attempts to implement them began immediately after the fall of the shah's regime and the Pentagon's loss of its main support base in this region--on Iranian territory. Citing "Arab diplomatic sources," the American press reported a few days ago that the Somali Government has decided to concede to U.S. solicitations and grant the United States the military base.

Such, in brief, is the history of a lesson stemming solely from a single fabrication about a "Soviet threat." This threat proved to be illusory, whereas the real threat stemmed and continues to stem from those attempting to ascribe it to the Soviet Union.

Christopher's TV Comments

LD072250 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1957 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Washington--Concentrating the largest naval armada for the past quarter century off the shores of Iran, under the pretext of a crisis in U.S.-Iranian relations, the United States is bent on strengthening its military presence in this region on a permanent basis.

Speaking on television, W. Christopher, U.S. deputy secretary of state, said that "the United States is at present undertaking a series of important steps aimed at strengthening its military positions in the Middle East." He named among these the deployment of an operative naval force group in the Indian Ocean, the modernization of the naval and air force base on the Island of Diego Garcia, and also the search for new bases and military installations, including ports and airports, on the territory of Kenya, Somalia and Oman. Christopher also said that the United States is examining the question of utilization by U.S. Armed Forces of military bases in Egypt and Israel.

'Favorable Replies' on Bases

LD041540 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1445 GMT 4 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Washington--A Pentagon spokesman has stated that the United States has received favorable replies from certain countries in the Near East and North Africa concerning the use of their bases for the transfer of American invasion forces. He also let it be understood that American military representatives will soon pay another visit to Somalia, Oman, Saudi Arabia and Kenya, this time for a careful examination of bases and other military installations.

Nimetz, U.S. deputy secretary of state [title as heard] leaves for Turkey today for talks on the further use of existing American military bases on Turkish territory. Together with the drawing up of plans for direct military intervention in Iran, the United States, to judge by press reports, is intensifying secret subversive operations in the country.

KORIONOV: U.S. USES IRAN CRISIS AS PRETEXT FOR NEW BASES

LD080905 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jan 80 p 5 LD

[Vitaly Korionov "Political Observer's Notes": "The Designs of the 'Geostrategists'"]

[Text] Reports from which it is becoming increasingly obvious that influential circles in Washington have decided to exploit the U.S.-Iranian conflict as a pretext for the implementation of far-reaching designs have been pouring forth in abundance from the pages of the American press recently. The plan is to create military-strategic bridgeheads from which U.S. imperialism can threaten countries which have chosen a progressive path of development and carry out punitive actions against peoples struggling for national independence. Its sights are trained not only the Persian Gulf region but also the Indian Ocean and still other regions where the anti-imperialist liberation movement is growing.

In an interview with the U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT in late December Z. Brzezinski stated: "The United States is facing two problems of essential importance: the first is the challenge to our geostrategic position in the world and the second is the challenge to our mutual relations with the two-thirds of the world which has undergone a sudden political awakening in the last two decades."

American journalist H. Smith has written that the Tehran hostages incident is viewed in Washington as "a turning point marking the end of the post-Vietnam era." What is the hidden meaning behind this? H. Smith answers this question in the words of some "prominent strategist" in Washington: [paragraph continues]

"We are beginning to shake off the restraint dictated by Vietnam." Thus, the window dressing of verbal declarations about peace is being thrown aside and a course aimed at preparing and implementing further aggressive military actions is being openly proclaimed.

A Richard Burt article published in the New York TIMES in the last 5 days of December is of interest in this connection. Judging by Brzezinski's words, the article stated, the U.S. administration is taking steps "in the direction of a radical change of policy in this region" (this is primarily a reference to the Near East region). The United States, Burt wrote, "is confronted by the most important strategic question of recent decades"--the question of "renewed American responsibility in this region." In Burt's words, among other actions Washington is examining plans for creating a pro-Western alliance including Egypt, Israel, Turkey and Saudi Arabia.

Observers' attention has been drawn by the visit made to certain Near East and Eastern African countries late last year by a group of high-ranking Pentagon and State Department officials. The group visited Saudi Arabia, Oman, Somalia and Kenya. The report compiled by the group is still being examined by the U.S. administration, but what Washington is contemplating is already clear from press reports.

"The United States," the New York DAILY NEWS proclaims, "is seeking out buildup areas for actions in the Near East." New York TIMES military observer D. Middleton explains for his part that the Pentagon is seeking sites for U.S. military bases which will "serve if necessary as a bridgehead for American intervention...." Yet another journalist, R. Halloran, writes in the same newspaper that the Pentagon is stealthily try to acquire the Somali naval base at Berbera. The specific calculations linked with this base can be seen from the following comment by Halloran: "Access to Berbera would enable the United States to support ships and aircraft in the Red Sea, the Gulf of Aden, the Arabian Sea, the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean. It would be a support in the utilization by the United States of the naval base and airfield on Diego Garcia Island in the Indian Ocean, the logistical stockpiles in Bahrain and the airfiled in Turkey."

What we have here is a most graphic example of the objective served by the provocative squawks about the "Soviet military threat." It is not so long ago that American propaganda organs were saying that the Soviet Union intended to have a "military base" at Berbera. This was a manifest distortion of the facts since the Soviet Union does not seek bases in the thickets of Africa, the jungles of Asia or anywhere else. Everybody can now see why such fabrications were needed. There is no Soviet military base at Berbera, but the Pentagon, on the other hand, is fully determined to install itself here with its iron-shod boot. The American military threat to peace--that is a real fact.

The inspirers of the aforementioned aggressive plans care nothing for the needs and aspirations of peoples striving for independence and social progress. They are not only extending their tentacles in the direction of other peoples' national property but cynically advertise their ambitions. America's CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, for example, proclaims: "The chief prize in the Near East is the vast and rich kingdom of Saudi Arabia."

Thus, the objective behind the concentration of U.S. naval and air forces in the Persian Gulf region is becoming increasingly obvious and the purpose of the punitive gendarme formations known as the "quick reaction forces" is becoming increasingly clear. The purpose of, for example, the Brzezinski "concept" of an "arc of crises" where the United States virtually claims the "right" to do everything it fancies under the pretext of "defending" its "vitally important interests" is being revealed in a most convincing manner.

However, the more overtly the imperilaist neocolonialists and generals dreaming of transforming entire countries into military firing ranges reveal their motives, the greater the freedom-loving people's determination to deal an active rebuff to these designs.

TASS REPORTS DEPARTURE OF USE NIMITZ FROM NAPLES FOR PERSIAN GULF

LD041204 Moscow TASS in English 1110 GMT 4 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Rome, January 4, TASS--The U.S. atomic aircraft carrier Nimitz sailed out of the port of Naples setting course for the Persian Gulf where a unit of U.S. naval force consisting of more than 20 ships is operating now. The Nimitz aircraft carrier, one of the biggest warships of the U.S. Navy, took the route around the African Continent. Because of its huge size, it cannot navigate the Suez Canal. The aircraft carrier is expected to reach the Persian Gulf area late in January.

NIMETZ LEAVES FOR TURKEY TO SECURE USE OF BASES

LD041813 Moscow in Turkish to Turkey 1400 GMT 4 Jan 80 LD

[Summary] Matthew Nimetz left Washington for Turkey to hold talks on the status of the U.S. bases on Turkish soil. Currently there are thousands of U.S. servicemen on the 26 American military bases in Turkey. The importance of these bases has grown in the overall strategy of the Pentagon following the Iranian revolution.

"The United States is now seeking new military springboards in the Middle East and the Gulf, for use in so-called 'crisis situations.' According to observers' estimation, Nimetz will offer his partners economic aid during his talks in Turkey in return for acquiescence on the decision to make use of the bases."

Mission Aim: Tracking Stations

LD051445 Moscow TASS in English 1245 GMT 5 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Washington, January 5, TASS--Making use of the crisis in the U.S.-Iranian relations, the United States is boosting efforts to further draw Turkey into NATO's aggressive preparations. A U.S. high-ranking military-political mission, consisting of representatives of the Pentagon and the State Department left for Ankara by air of Friday. As observers note, the mission is assigned one main task--to wrest consent from Ankara to a wide use by the Pentagon of the military bases in Turkish territory for electronic espionage against the Soviet Union. George Wilson, military observer of the Washington POST, writes, in particular, that Turkish tracking stations acquire a particular importance in view of the loss of the bases in Iran by the United States.

In exchange, Washington's emissaries are to offer a new program of military-economic aid to Turkey. According to the press, they are bringing with them a draft bilateral agreement envisaging the allocation of 450 million dollars to Ankara. Of the sum, 250 million dollars is assigned as commercial credits for the purchase of U.S. weapons, 198 million dollars for economic aid, and another two million dollars for the training of Turkish military personnel. The offered sum is a drop in a sea of Turkey's requirements, considering that it now experiences serious economic difficulties. As is known, Turkey repeatedly applied to Western countries in a request for urgent aid to revitalize the economy to an amount of several millions of dollars. The appeals, however, remained unanswered.

Some observers directly associate Washington's niggardliness with the cynical stand of Washington which seeks to attain its aims with 'a minimum outlay'. They recall that Washington spares no means, ingratiating itself with countries which are 'necessary' to it. Thus, recently alone the Carter administration took a decision to increase the already-billions-worth special aid to its 'partners' for the anti-Arab Camp David collusion--the Tel Aviv aggressors and their Egyptian henchmen.

Suyetina Commentary

LD052142 Moscow in Turkish to Turkey 1830 GMT 4 Jan 80 LD

[Lidiya Suyetina commentary]

[Excerpts] Reports from the Near and Middle East indicate that the United States continues to increase its military buildup in the region. [passage omitted]

Parallel with the recent stepping up of American war preparations in the Near and Middle East, as well as in West Europe, a noisy campaign of slander is being conducted concerning Soviet-Afghan military cooperation. As you know, the Afghan Government asked the Soviet Union for political, economic and military assistance due to the external danger to Afghanistan. Our country has sent a limited number of Soviet military units to Afghanistan in response to the Afghan Government's request and in accordance with the Soviet-Afghan friendship and cooperation treaty. At the same time it has been announced, repeatedly and clearly, that the Soviet military units will leave Afghanistan when peace and security are insured in the region. But the American imperialists who have been organizing aggressive acts of militancy against the Afghan Democratic Republic, as well as the Chinese hegemonists who have been acting as their sidekicks and the reactionary circles of some other countries, are turning a deaf ear to these statements. With a view to diverting world public opinion away from America's extensive war preparations in the Near and Middle East, as well as in West Europe, imperialist propaganda has raised a hullabaloo about an alleged Soviet intervention in Afghanistan. But this worn out imperialist method cannot deceive the democratic forces of various countries, including Turkey. As the Turkish progressive press points out, many people understand very well that America is trying to draw attention away from its subversive activities against Afghanistan, Iran and other countries in the region by a noisy propaganda campaign. Furthermore, many Turkish citizens are quite justifiably concerned over Washington's desire to drag Turkey further along the U.S. militarist policy.

The status of the U.S. military bases in Turkey has once again become a topic of the day. As it is known, the agreement on this subject expires on 9 January. The United States, however, does not want to withdraw from Turkey. U.S. military personnel have been in Turkey for about 30 years, and the United States is not going to withdraw its military personnel. On the contrary, Washington is engaged in efforts for an early conclusion of a new military agreement with Turkey. This agreement is expected to be initialled next week. On the other hand, it is well known that the existence of U.S. bases and U.S. troops in Turkey has led to extensive protests by Turkish people. Subversive activities contrary to peace and the security of the country [words indistinct] from these bases. No one can deny that the peoples of the Near and Middle East possess the right to peace, security, independence, and sovereignty and--quite naturally--the peoples of the Near and Middle East possess the right to conduct their lives according to their own wishes.

ATTEMPTS TO TRY TO BUILD NEW MIDEAST 'MILITARY BLOC'

LD042318 Moscow TASS in English 2112 GMT 4 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Washington, January 4, TASS--The United States is speeding up the implementation of the plans of a sharp buildup of its "military presence" in the Persian Gulf, the Indian Ocean, the Red and Arabian Sea. As the U.S. Defence Department reports, a group of Pentagon experts is planning to visit soon the "strategic" Oman, Somali and Kenya to discuss "specific issues" pertaining to the granting on "leased" to the United States of military bases in the territories of these states.

Late last year a high ranking U.S. military diplomatic delegation visited these countries with such aims. I. Ross, U.S. assistant defence secretary (press) said that the leaders of the two countries had "favourably responded" to the request of the USA for the granting of their military bases for the U.S. Navy and Air Force. The USA is particularly interested in getting access to the Berbera Base in Somalia, which will enable it to ensure the logistic support of the ships and aircraft operating in the Red and Arabian seas, the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean.

As the newspaper Washington POST points out, the Pentagon's present efforts are part of the broader U.S. plans directed at ensuring "permanent military presence" in the Persian Gulf area, the Arabian Sea and the Indian Ocean. Simultaneously with a feverish search for new military bases in that region to meet an "emergency," the newspaper writes, the United States continues knocking together a quickreaction corps, which is viewed by world public as a real threat in the first place to the developing countries. This police force must become the main strike force of U.S. imperialism in the suppression of the national liberation movements in the Asian, American and Latin American countries. The Pentagon's military preparations are spearheaded in the first place against the countries, which following Iran's example may establish their control over national wealth, the Washington POST writes in this connection.

The newspaper NEWSDAY describes this course as "open interventionism". The United States, it points out, has not only returned to the idea of using military force for the defence of its military strategic interests, but is also paving the road for a U.S. crusade against revolutionary nationalism.

The newspaper New York TIMES quotes authoritative sources of the administration as saying that with (?this) [word indistinct] the United States has put on the order of the day the idea of creating a new military bloc, similar to NATO in the Middle East and in the Persian Gulf area. Washington, the newspaper writes, would like to draw into that alliance, Egypt, Israel, Oman, Saudi.Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Somalia, Pakistan, Jordan and Morocco. The newspaper also points to the possible membership in it of such U.S. partners in NATO as Britain, France, West Germany as well as Japan and China.

While stepping up its military preparations in the hot spots of the world, the United States is putting on the uniform of a "world gendarme" threatening many states, which struggle for genuine political and economic independence from Washington.

MOROZOV EXAMINES MUSLIM ANTI-AMERICAN FEELING

LD071317 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Jan 80 p 3 LD

[N. Morozov article: "World Policeman Strategy"]

[Text] An unprecedentedly strong wave of anti-American feeling has recently swept through the Muslim world, which numbers more than 700 million people. Iranian students are still holding the American Embassy in Tehran, demanding the extradition and trial of the deposed shah. In Islamabad Pakistanis burned the American Embassy and Information Center. Muslim demonstrations have taken place in many other Pakistani cities and in Bangladesh, Turkey and a number of other countries. At their recent 10th conference of Arab heads of state and government in Tunis anti-American sentiments were clearly voiced by the progressive Arab countries in connection with the policy of support for the Israeli aggressors by the U.S. Government.

In an attempt to pressure Iran, the Americans have moved warships to the shores of the Persian Gulf and are evacuating from their embassies in 11 Muslim countries diplomatic personnel, members of their families and businessmen whose presence is "nonessential." The countries from which American diplomats are being withdrawn include Iraq, Syria, Libya, Bangladesh and others. Washington believes that these measures will facilitate for the Carter administration the "task of taking energetic measures against Iran with the minimum risk of massive reprisals against Americans in other countries."

The flareup of anti-American feeling in the Muslim countries has taken Washington politicians by surprise. Z. Brzezinski, the U.S. Presidential assistant for national security, has given instructions for the creation of a special committee to study political doctrines based on the principles of Islam and the canons of Muslim law; at the same time an attempt is being made to discover the reasons for the anti-American sentiments. For its part the American press, which is presenting in a sensational spirit the news of the crisis in Iranian-American relations and of the anti-American demonstrations, is now trying to suggest to readers that the United States has always given "aid and support" to Muslims, so, it claims, there are no grounds for them to oppose the United States. If that is the case, the greatest diehards argue, it means the anti-American demonstrations have been "foisted" on Muslims; it means they are the "intrigues of a foreign power" trying to undermine U.S. positions in the Near and Middle East.

In his book "Cairo" the British writer James Aldridge describes the Americans' first appearance in Egypt in the second half of the 19th century. At that time the Yankees created a sensation by behaving like "Wild West" cowboys. "They were always getting into trouble since they insisted on being treated as gentlemen, and believed as gentlemen that for them anything was permitted," he wrote.

The American approach to the Muslim world has changed little since then. However, the Muslim world has changed. Today the peoples of Asia and Africa, where hundreds of millions of people profess Islam, rightly believe that the American "gentlemen" should treat them and their religious doctrines with respect and not outrage believers' feelings by supporting odious political figures who have sullied themselves with crimes against their own people.

U.S. officials are now expressing indignation, are saying they "cannot understand" what has caused the flareup of anti-American feeling and are talking sourly of "ungrateful Muslims"--Iranians, Arabs, Pakistanis and other peoples--who, you see, just "cannot get it into their heads" that American policies bring them only peace and prosperity. But aren't the Americans playing the hypocrite in endeavoring to suggest these "innocent" arguments to the public? Aren't they trying to present black as white? Let us look at the facts.

Let's start with Iran. Iranians still remember the events of the beginning of the 1950's, when the Mossadeq government in Iran nationalized the oil industry and for this was overthrown by the Americans and their agents.

Harriman, personal representative of the U.S. President, arrived in Tehran 15 June 1951. A 100,000-strong protest demonstration was held in the capital on the day of his arrival and was fired on, to please the Americans. Some 100 dead and 500 wounded--that was the bloody result of this brutal reprisal by the shah's secret police.

Later, in 1951-1953, thousands of Iranians protesting at the shah's tyranny and at the interference by the Americans were also shot down on the streets of Tehran, Ahwaz, Abadan and other Iranian cities. Even the mosques in which they took refuge, which are regarded throughout the Muslim world as a place of sanctuary in which it is forbidden to carry weapons, let alone to commit reprisals and murder, could not save them.

"In 1953 the United States organized a coup in Iran, overthrowing the legitimate government and foisting the shah on the Iranian people," a statement by the Iranian Mission to the United Nations said. "From then on the U.S. Embassy in Tehran and its puppet--the shah--turned Iran into a colossal prison ruled by torture and murder."

Or take a different kind of example. When I was working in North Yemen in the early 1960's I met Bruce Conde, an American intelligence agent who had adopted Islam and the name of 'Abd ar-Rahman so as to be able to travel and collect espionage information in a country virtually closed to foreigners. Yemen's Muslim divines took a dim view of the farce of adopting Islam and a new name. The reasons that had made Conde, a descendant of French counts, become a Muslim were too clear.

Surely that is evidence of the Americans' lack of respect for Islam--cynically exploiting the advantages granted to a Muslim in a Muslim country for the dirty deeds of the CIA and its agents! The story of the American intelligence agent's transformation into a Muslim at one time received great publicity. In 1961 'Abd ar-Rahman Conde was expelled from Yemen on charges of spying and interfering in the country's internal affairs.

The Americans not only interfere themselves in Muslim countries' internal affairs and outrage believers' feelings, but often encourage or justify such actions by their allies. America's yes-men in Cairo, who, along with Israel, are trying today to justify U.S. policy vis-a-vis Iran, are "forgetting" the facts of the British colonialists' bloody reprisals against the Egyptian people, who in 1951 managed to annul the unfair 1936 Anglo-Egyptian treaty. At the time the U.S. State Department officially supported the actions taken by the British, who moved troops in for reprisals against the Egyptians who had dared scorn "friendship" with the colonialists.

In October 1951 the British opened machinegun fire on praying Muslims at the entrance to a mosque in Port Said, killing 10 people. In November the British burst into the Nafisah Mosque in Ismailia and plundered it.

Just a few facts from the plenty available have been cited here. But even they testify that in every Near and Middle Eastern country where the American "gentlemen" have appeared, they have behaved unceremoniously, without respect for the local customs, faith and traditions, and have opposed democratic forces and those who advocated national liberation. It is this that constitutes one of the deep-seated reasons for today's anti-American demonstrations sweeping through the Near and Middle Eastern countries.

The development of recent events in Afghanistan confirms that there too the United States is trying to carry out subversive activity aimed against the Afghan people. The U.S., and also British and Chinese special services--those are the true organizers of aggressive actions against the DRA [Democratic Republic of Afghanistan]. They are using foreign territory--particularly Pakistani territory--to form, train and arm subversive gangs directed against the Afghan revolution.

The Washington administration's decision to grant $100 million to Pakistan for armaments is entirely connected with the U.S. strategy calculated to strike blows against the Afghan people's revolutionary gains and to strengthen reactionary forces in the so-called "arc of instability" near the Soviet Union's borders. The Pentagon's hope is simple: At all costs to "justify the U.S. military presence in this region and to contribute to exacerbating tension there so this can be used for the pursuit of a 'world policeman' policy."

The United States is now kicking up an outcry about the temporary operation to help Afghanistan repel external aggression, aid given by the Soviet Union by reason of repeated requests from the DRA Government. Of course, Washington would like no one to help the Afghan people and would like the DRA to open its doors to acts of subversion by external forces and counterrevolution. But the world has changed, and the Afghan people can count on the support of faithful friends.

LARGE ARMS DELIVERIES TO TAIWAN CONTINUE

LD050434 Moscow TASS in English 1921 GMT 4 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Washington, January 4, TASS--The U.S. administration announced the sale of a large batch of armaments to Taiwan to the tune of 280 million dollars. The batch includes rockets, artillery pieces and other types of combat equipment. Despite the annulment of the military treaty with Taipei by Washington, deliveries of U.S. weapons to Taiwan are continued. Though a year ago the USA established full diplomatic relations with the PRC, the entire complex of U.S.-Taiwan contacts virtually keeps on, the only difference being that they are now called 'unofficial'.

As is reported, a high-ranking military spokesman in Taipei, having expressed satisfaction with the resumption of U.S. military deliveries, stated that the present big batch of arms cannot satisfy all the requirements and that Taiwan expects that the sales of arms will be continued.

According to a statement by the State Department, Washington notified Beijing of its decision to resume deliveries of arms to Taiwan. The reaction of the Chinese capital, to where U.S. Defence Secretary Harold Brown is arriving tomorrow at the invitation of the Government of the PRC, is not reported.

TASS ASSAILS DEVELOPMENT OF F-X COMBAT PLANE

LD052344 Moscow TASS in English 1054 GMT 5 Jan 80 LD

["Build Up of Arms Exports"--TASS headline]

[Text] Washington, January 5, TASS--Having taken the course of military strategic expansion abroad and of build-up of combat potentials of the regimes which are to its liking, the U.S. Government gave up its own alluring promises "to strive for limitation" of trade in arms.

[Word indistinct] was stated by the U.S. Department of State, President J. Carter has taken the decision on developing a new modern fighter-bomber, designed exclusively for deliveries to "friendly" countries. Conventionally called F-X, the would-be combat plane will be used both as an interceptor and bomber. The F-X will be developed by the Pentagon's two leading contractors--the Northrop and the General Dynamics concerns. According to the Department of State, the government has already assured them that it will not "stand in the way" of aircraft sales abroad, and as is recalled by the UPI in this connection, in its statement made in 1977 about the policy in the sphere of trade in armaments the government solemnly declared that it will not allow deliveries of modern arms to the areas which do not have such arms.

As is noted by commentators, the government has never took seriously its promises to display restraint in military deliveries to foreign states.

In the past years the volumes of lethal exports to Washington's clients have been steadily on the rise, reaching an annual record figure of 11,000 million-13,500 million dollars. Suffice it to say that in recent time alone the White House adopted a series of programs of a sharp rise in military aid to Cairo and Tel Aviv, the accomplices in the anti-Arab separate deal, Saudi Arabia, South Korea, a number of reactionary Persian Gulf regimes, and some other countries.

The mounting people's liberation movements of the peoples of the Middle East, Asia, Africa and Latin America has compelled Washington to go back on its propaganda "pledges" and to start openly equipping its "strongholds" with the most up-to-date weapons.

KEFLAVIK BEING TURNED INTO 'KEY NUCLEAR FACILITY' BY U.S.

LD041309 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Dec 79 p 3 LD

[APN correspondent S. Serebryakov article written specially for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA: "The U.S. Base in Keflavik"]

[Text] According to foreign press reports, the United States is gradually turning the naval base in Keflavik into a key facility in its nuclear arms system in the North Atlantic. Iceland's THJODVILJINN writes this in connection with reports that two U.S. E-3A aircraft fitted with the AWACS [airborne warning and control] system at the Keflavik Base have been assigned the role of flying control centers in the event of nuclear war.

The stationing of these aircraft here, the newspaper stresses, is evidence that the functions of the Keflavik Base have changed totally over the last few years: "It is certainly a question of a nuclear facility."

Many foreign specialists on peace and armaments problems, an editorial in THJODVILJINN says, have repeatedly conjectured that there are nuclear weapons in Iceland. The reports regarding the E-3A aircraft are new confirmation that the Keflavik Base is an important element in the NATO and U.S. nuclear arms system.

THJODVILJINN also cites the influential Swedish newspaper DAGENS NYHETER. According to the latter, more than 150 F-111 bombers capable of delivering nuclear weapons deep into USSR territory are stationed on British territory. In the event of a nuclear conflict, DAGENS NYHETER writes, the F-111s' actions will be guided from on board an E-3A.

Asked by a THJODVILJINN correspondent whether conditions for servicing F-111 aircraft exist at the Keflavik Base and whether the aircraft have ever been there, Perry (Biskhop) the American press relations officer, said that the base is capable of handling most types of aviation equipment. He added that F-111s have landed at Keflavik only when traveling from the United States to Europe.

THJODVILJINN believes that the change in the purpose of the base and its conversion from a submarine surveillance facility to an operations control center for aircraft carrying nuclear weapons may have dangerous consequences for Iceland. Iceland is being drawn into a nuclear arms system, despite its principled opposition to the deployment of nuclear weapons on its territory.

REJOINDER SEES 'POLITICAL COLOR BLINDNESS' IN BRZEZINSKI VIEWS

LD041139 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 Dec 79 p 3 LD

[I. Andreyev "Rejoinder": "Political Color Blindness? On a Z. Brezezinski Interview"]

[Text] The other day Z. Brzezinski, President Carter's national security adviser, gave a long interview on foreign policy issues to the well-known American Journal U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT. In fact he spoke out in order to agitate for the United States to implement a "position of strength" foreign policy, a policy of diktat and interference in other countries' and peoples' affairs. His remarks reveal above all fear in the face of the growth of the national liberation movement and anti-imperialist trends in the Near and Middle East and in Asia, Africa and Latin America in general. This has apparently placed Mr Brzezinski almost in a state of shock. He even speaks of the "unexpected emergence (!) in the world arena of Asian, African and Latin American countries."

Mr Brzezinski is disturbed at the way in which U.S. relations with these countries--particularly Muslim countries--are developing in present conditions, and calls for the development of "more meaningful relations" with them. But it turns out that the U.S. President's adviser understands this "meaningfulness" in a particular way. In face he has one concrete idea on this score: He is confident that for the sake of "maintaining stability" U.S. military might in that region (that is, the Near and Middle East) "will in time be manifested on a more permanent basis."

Mr Brzezinski is obviously not satisfied that dozens of U.S. warships, including several aircraft carriers carrying hundreds of bombers ready for flight, have already been moved closer to the shores of Arab countries and Iran as a military or rather an overt threat. They are promising the peoples of those countries that in the future the raised stick policy will be organized "on a permanent basis"

Fear in the face of national liberation and anti-imperialist trends in the policy of Asian, African and Latin American states, and also inveterate hostility and prejudice with respect to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries prevent Mr Brzezinski from seeing things as they are and incite him to draw a quite distorted picture of the world, sometimes going as far as outright absurdity.

Suffice it to say, for instance, that as one of the main inspirers and originators of the policy which is now arousing understandable indignation in many Muslim countries in Asia and Africa, Mr Brzezinski was not ashamed in his interview to take the part of a kind of champion of Islam and "defender of the religious rights" of Muslims against imaginary encroachments from...the Soviet Union.

Or another example. Mr Brzezinski dwells on the situation in Southeast Asia in his remarks. As is known, in that region the Beijing leaders' great-power policy recently led to the extermination of millions of Kampucheans by the Chinese henchmen, Pol Pot's butchers. Last spring China committed an act of overt aggression against Vietnam, invading that country and forcing the heroic Vietnamese people to take up arms again to defend their independence and freedom. And to this day the threats of a new attack on Vietnam have not died down. What does Mr Brzezinski have to say about that? Well, you see, he laments the "Vietnamese people's aggressiveness" and says sympathetically that "China is deeply concerned" about that "Vietnamese aggressiveness"!

Here we have a really acrobatic ability to turn everything on its head. Or is it a kind of political color blindness, an inability to distinquish white from black? Political color blindness is generally a dangerous ailment. It gives rise to erroneous judgements and risky actions. But when this ailment affects a man entrusted with great power and responsibility, like an adviser to the U.S. President, it can be dangerous for millions of other people.

COMMENT ON U.S. USE OF FORCE TO SUPPORT FOREIGN POLICY

ID041706 Moscow TASS in English 1636 GMT 4 Jan 80 ID

[Igor Orlov: "The Past and the Present of Washington's Landing Diplomacy"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, January 4, TASS--Now that Washington is frantically looking for new springboards at a distance of many thousands of miles from its borders, and the intensive movement of U.S. warships near Iran's shores and in the Mediterranean arouse the warranted concern of the world public, many observers draw attention to the fact that the policy of U.S. armed interference in the affairs of other states conforms to the long-established U.S. doctrine. Hans Morgenthau, a noted U.S. historian, explains, in particular, that in international politics, military force which can be used in practice or used as a threat is the most important material factor ensuring the political might of a state. Acting in keeping with that doctrine, Washington introduced so-called landing diplomacy into the practice of its international relations.

Researchers from the U.S. Brookings Institution established that over less than thirty post-war years (from 1946 to 1975) the USA used its landing troops 71 times to achieve its foreign-policy goals. On the whole, Washington (according to the same data) over the same period resorted to the use of its armed forces for the same purposes 215 times. It is important to bear in mind that most often the USA acted not at the request of some or other national governments but, vice versa, contrary to their explicit wish, violating the sovereignty and independence of states, i.e., flagrantly violating the UN Charter and the basic principles of international law.

The U.S. interventionist actions are known to have been spearheaded against the national-liberation movements in the Middle East, in Asia, Latin America and Africa. Researchers from the Brookings Institution note that the 'curve' of the use of the United States armed forces in support of its foreign policy went upward particularly steeply from 1956 to 1965 alone, Washington used or threatened to use armed forces in the international arena twenty times.

Judging by the activity which now manifests itself in the preparation of a gendarme rapid-reaction corps, the deployment of U.S. naval forces in the Persian Gulf area and the Indian Ocean, and the open threats to other countries, particularly to Iran, the world may again become a witness to an upward crawling of the 'curve' of the use of the armed forces by U.S. imperialism in support of its foreign policy against this or that country which pursues a course unwelcome to Washington. And those actions will, of course, like before be carried out under a noisy propagandist screen of inventions about a 'Soviet threat'. The international public at large, however, cannot ignore real facts exposing the past and present neo-colonialist aspirations of the U.S. ruling circles. Facts are stubborn things, as the saying goes. They warn and call for vigilance.

DADYANTS ARTICLE DISCUSSES DECLINE OF U.S. PRESTIGE

ID041641 [Editorial Report ID] Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian, 28 December 1979 publishes on page 3 a 1,700-word article by international observer G. Dadyants entitled "What Has Happened to America." The article discusses the fall in U.S. prestige in international affairs in recent years, claiming that this has been brought about not so much by weak leadership on the part of President Carter as by the deteriorating state of the U.S. economy. Dadyants goes on to maintain that the United States is seeking to compensate for the loss of its leading role in the economic and political spheres by building up its military strength. But, he says, U.S. problems "cannot be resolved by reviving the cold war and increasing confrontation with the Soviet Union," and restrictions on trade with socialist countries merely harm the United States.

REPORTAGE, COMMENTARY ON SECRETARY BROWN'S VISIT

Purpose of Visit

LD081100 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0130 GMT 8 Jan 80 LD

[From the "International Diary" program presented by (Georgiy Dzhirkevelov)]

[Text] Talks are taking place in Beijing today between U.S. Defense Secretary Brown and Deng Xiaoping, vice premier of the PRC State Council. On Monday the American minister met Geng Biao, vice premier of the State Council, and other civilian and military officials. Brown's visit is aimed primarily at expanding American-Chinese military cooperation and providing American technology to China for the production of various kinds of weapons. The talks also testify to the fact that American imperialism with Beijing is continuing to weave the threads of a plot against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. Speaking at a reception in Beijing, Brown and his Chinese colleague Xu Xianqiang let it be understood that the United States and China intend jointly to activate subversive operations against the legitimate Government of Afghanistan.

Western Press Cited

LD071950 Moscow TASS in English 1937 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

["Plot by Hegemonists"--TASS headline]

[Text] London, January 7, TASS--The talks between the U.S. Defence Secretary Harold Brown and the Chinese leaders, which began in Beijing today, attract close attention of the Western press. On the eve of the visit observers wrote that Brown's main task is to utilize China for the expansion of U.S. support to the enemies of the Afghan revolution. Yet, after the Pentagon's chief made his speech in Beijing, which abounded in anti-Soviet attacks, the Western press emphasizes the important strategic nature of the visit.

The British DAILY EXPRESS unequivocally writes that Brown's speech foreshadows the formation of a military alliance to oppose the Soviet Union. Another British newspaper, FINANCIAL TIMES, is even more explicit, the growing similarity of interests between Beijing and the United States threatens to bury the policy of impartiality in relations with China and the Soviet Union declared by the United States earlier. The British papers are echoed by an observer in the U.S. Washington POST, John Mathews, who stressed that Brown's speech was the strongest statement of the possible opposition to the Soviet Union with the help of China.

These statements eloquently demonstrate the role which Washington is planning for China in its hegemonistic plans. Brown's mission to Beijing pursues interests hostile to peace. Washington is undoubtedly trying to utilize the fact that the Chinese leaders side with reactionary forces in their struggle against national liberation movements.

Brown, Biao Meeting

LD072155 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

[From the "International Diary" program; name of presenter indistinct]

[Text] A REUTER correspondent reports that a meeting took place in Beijing today between Brown, U.S. secretary of defense, and Geng Biao, deputy chairman of the PRC State Council, and other officials and military men. The correspondent apparently (?did not think worth mentioning) the great number of Chinese military men who were present at this meeting.

It is known that Brown's visit is aimed primarily at the expansion of U.S.-Chinese military cooperation and at providing U.S. technology to the Chinese to produce weapons of various kinds. Another issue discussed by the two sides was that of expanding military assistance to the Afghan counterrevolutionaries who are based in Pakistan. The telegram says that full understanding was reached in this respect too.

One could not expect any other outcome from the visit. The malicious campaign of slander being waged by the United States against the Soviet Union in connection with the events in Afghanistan, was at once joined in by Beijing, in unison with Washington.

Sergeyev Commentary

LD051642 Moscow in English to South and Southeast Asia 1400 GMT 5 Jan 80 LD

[Boris Sergeyev commentary]

[Text] Washington has started the new year, just as it did the previous one, with playing the China card. The first visit to be paid by a high-ranking American official to another country this year is Defense Secretary Brown's journey to China. Observers view this as an additional evidence of priorities America gives Beijing in its policies in Asia.

Many observers have pointed to another major circumstance that gives special meaning to Harold Brown's visit to China. The London DAILY EXPRESS, for instance, sees a direct link between the new round in the American-Chinese rapprochement and the events in Afghanistan and Iran. According to informed newspaper circles, these events have given an impetus to discussions in the Pentagon on close military cooperation between Washington and Beijing. So far, to judge by official American statements, Washington has refrained from selling arms to China, though it does not object to sales by its NATO allies. But there is a strong lobbying in the United States for direct military links with China. Beijing too has started acting more vigorously in this direction. Observers have noted that Deng Xiaoping, the main figure in Chinese foreign policy, returns to the subject of Sino-American cooperation at each meeting with American officials. Can the Chinese leaders count on earning Washington's favor under the present circumstances? Anyway, they are trying hard. Harold Brown has every reason to be pleased with his Chinese hosts. Everything American strategy-makers in the Pentagon have been planning and executing in Asia and adjacent regions has been approved in Beijing, tacitly or publicly.

The zeal with which the Chinese leaders have been defending the Pentagon's dangerous plans can only be matched by the arrogance with which they trample on the interests of most Asian countries, China's neighbors first and foremost. A recent publication in the Chinese newspaper PEOPLE'S DAILY makes it clear that the Chinese and American leaders see eye to eye in assessing the events in Afghanistan. Both Beijing and Washington have decided to capitalize on the internal changes in that country, changes that in no way affect the security of Afghanistan's neighbors, to pump up tensions in South Asia.

The majority of Asian nations realize, however, that if there is a real threat to peace and security on the subcontinent, it is coming from American and Chinese actions only. This specifically is the view of the government circles in India, with respect to Washington's decision to lift the embargo on arms supplies to Pakistan, and to sell it modern weapons worth $100 million.

It is safe to assume that Beijing's eagerness to help promote American policies in Asia, the south of it in particular, cannot remain unnoticed in Washington. It might even tell on the outcome of Harold Brown's talks in the Chinese capital. At any rate, the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, referring to informed sources, has reported that the American administration is now considering how far it can go in selling China the newest American technology, including technology that could be used for military purposes. As far as Beijing is concerned, it is not far to figure how far it can go in using the equipment, considering its hostile acts against India, Vietnam, Afghanistan and other neighbors.

NOVOYE VREMYA STRESSES FRIENDLY FEELINGS TOWARD PRC PEOPLE

LD041133 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 52, 21 Dec 79 p 31 LD

[Observer Yuriy Tavrovskiy answer to reader's letter under the general heading "Conversation With Readers"--first graf is reader's letter]

[Text] I have recently returned from a fascinating trip to China. The guide who accompanied our group said that the Soviet newspapers and journals carry anti-Chinese propaganda and therefore the Chinese press is obliged to respond in the same way. Our newspapers also often write that Moscow is sharpening the tone of its polemics with Beijing so as to reinforce traditional anti-Chinese sentiments.... [signed] Robert D. (Vort), Berkeley, United States.

I have often had occasion to talk about the situation in China to all kinds of audiences. Only recently I met with Moscow workers and engineers, teachers in the ancient city of Vladimir and students and railroad workers in Khabarovsk--a city on the border with China.... I will make no secret of the fact that my interlocutors sharply condemn the Chinese leadership's policy. But I have never once heard a reproach aimed at the Chinese people themselves. They are spoken of with sincere sympathy and people warmly recall the years of Soviet-Chinese friendship. The older generation tells of participation in the liberation of northeastern China in 1945 and of work in the PRC in the fifties and sixties.

Many reasons could be cited as to why these warm feelings persist among Soviet people. I will mention the main one: The CPSU has educated and is educating the people in a spirit of deep respect toward all peoples, including so great a people as the Chinese. From the very start of the polemics unleashed from Beijing, the Soviet mass information organs have been explaining to their audience the fundamental distinction between the Chinese people and those who are implementing an anti-Soviet line in China. Soviet newspapers and journals not only critically evaluate Beijing's foreign policy acts but also express regret with respect to its domestic policy, which is not characteristic of socialism. And surely they were right when they considered the "Great Leap Forward," the "Cultural Revolution" and other experiments by Mao Zedong's group to be fatal?

Now even RENMIN RIBAO admits that "for many years we did one stupid thing after another, and then we were inevitably filling the gaps again and again and putting the ravaged economy to rights." Thus our views and assessments were and still are an objective analysis, and, it may be said, one form of helping the Chinese people. What has this got to do with "anti-Chinese propaganda"?

Despite the complexity of interstate relations, the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society continues to operate actively, arranging exhibitions, literary and musical soirees and showings of Chinese movies and holding public meetings in connection with memorable dates in Chinese history and anniversaries of well-known figures in Chinese science and culture. Soviet publishing houses annually publish many translations of works of Chinese classical and contemporary literature, historical and philosophical tracts and research into Chinese history, literature and language. In practically every library and in the homes of many bibliophiles there are translations of the classical novels "The Three Kingdoms," "The Water Margin," "Monkey," "The Dream of the Red Chamber," "The Story of Yueh Fei" and "The Golden Lotus," and also works by contemporary writers and poets--Lu Xin, Mao Dun, Zhao Shuli, Zhou Libo and Lao She. The list of publications in the last 8 years alone covers four typewritten pages. Surely, Mr (Vort), all this does not look like the "reinforcement of traditional anti-Chinese sentiments"?

Now a few words about the statements you have heard in the PRC and read in American newspapers. These are typical examples of the propaganda campaign being waged in China and also in Western countries. Its aim is to convince the peoples that there are allegedly objective historical reasons for the tension in Soviet-Chinese relations and that these lie in the "traditional mutual hostility between Russians and Chinese." And in that case, they say, the tension will persist for ever....

All the same I am sure, Mr (Vort), that the propaganda saboteurs will not succeed in achieveing their aim. There are no objective reasons for alienation, still less hostility, between the peoples of the USSR and the PRC. And the restoration of friendship and cooperation between them would accord not only with the vital interests of the two countries' peoples, but also with the aspirations of the entire world community.

SOUTH KOREAN DEMOCRATIZATION ATTACKED AS 'FORCED MANEUVER'

ID231504 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0350 GMT 23 Dec 79 ID

[PRAVDA commentary by Vyacheslav Razuvayev: "Reaction Maneuvers"]

[Text] The ceremony of the assumption of the office of presidency of South Korea has taken place in Seoul. The new president is Choe Kyu-ha, the closest aid of the murdered dictator Pak. not so long ago a group of high-ranking officials of his regime was arrested in Seoul. The military tribunal which heard their case meted out death sentences to the conspirators, among whom was the former director of the South Korean CIA, Kim Jae-kyu, who personally shot the dictator Pak on 26 October.

This killing came in the immediate wake of a series of massive antigovernment demonstrations by the people of South Korea, in which many thousands of workers, employees, students, representatives of the intelligentsia and business and religious circles took part. This expulsion of popular indignation scared the Seoul puppets and the transoceanic sponsors behind their backs. In an attempt to retain South Korea as a military and political bridgehead, taking account of the examples of Iran and Nicaragua, certain U.S. circles, as the Western press notes, thought it more reasonable to withdraw further support from the Seoul puppet who had compromised himself.

The supporters of the murdered dictator who have now come to power in Seoul are strongly advertising their measures intended to make the regime more democratic. Some time ago the notorious Emergency Decree No Nine was cancelled and a small group of previously arrested opposition leaders released. But this was only a drop in the ocean. There are still thousands of political prisoners in jail. Draconian anticommunist and other laws introduced by Pak are still in force.

At the ceremony marking his taking of the office of president, Choe Kyu-ha confirmed that the new authorities will go on striving for the further development of friendly links and cooperation with the United States in defense and in other fields.

It is obvious that the attempts of the compromised dictator Pak and the decision of the new Seoul rulers to democratize life in South Korea are nothing but forced maneuvers of South Korean reaction and their sponsors in Washington. They are designed to neutralize the wave of popular indignation over the policy of the Seoul regime and to hinder its liquidation.

'Power Struggle' in Seoul

SK060654 Moscow in Korean to Korea 0930 GMT 5 Jan 80 SK

[Text] The new regime in South Korea is trying to win support from Washington. Foreign Minister Pak Tong-chin disclosed a plan for a meeting between President Carter and Choe Kyu-ha.

Observers point out the instability of the present Seoul regime and the domestic situation of South Korea. Since the murder of dictator Pak Chong-hui, the power struggle in Seoul has continued among various political and military factions.

The new regime of South Korea is afraid of the growing people's advance for democracy.

PLANNED U.S.-SOUTH KOREAN MILITARY EXERCISE REPORTED

SK060658 Moscow in Korean to Korea 1330 GMT 5 Jan 80 SK

[Text] A joint U.S.-South Korea military exercise will be conducted in January and February, a report said. According to the report, this military exercise will include air support by army units and large-scale airlift operations of military units.

'Attempt to Intimidate Population'

LD052115 Moscow TASS in English 0850 GMT 5 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Tokyo, January 5, TASS--According reports from Seoul, large-scale military exercises of American troops began yesterday in the south of the Korean peninsula. 4,000 marines from the "quick reaction corps" were airlifted from Okinawa to participate in the exercises. This new demonstration of the U.S. military might is regarded here as an attempt to intimidate the population of South Korea where tense situation persists after the assassination of dictator Pak Chong-Hui in autumn last year.

OHIRA'S ANZUS TRIP, JAPAN'S 'PACIFIC OCEAN CONCEPT' DISCUSSED

LD050017 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1010 GMT 4 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Tokyo, 4 January, (TASS)--Japan's foreign policy department has actively started preparing for the visit of Prime Minister M. Ohira to Australia and New Zealand starting on 15 January.

Japan does not hide its interest in the development of economic relations with these countries, from which it imports 46 percent of the iron ore it needs, 45 percent of its coal and almost 70 percent of its bauxite and other raw materials.

As representatives of the Japanese Foreign Ministry have reported, the forthcoming visit by M. Ohira goes beyond the framework of bilateral relations with Australia and New Zealand, and is seen as an important step in the process of establishing close cooperation with the member-countries of ASEAN and the Pacific basin. In the talks in Canberra and Wellington there will be no discussion of questions connected with the so-called "concept of Pacific cooperation" developed by the Japanese Government.

This concept is directed at setting up a politico-economic alliance by a number of Pacific Ocean basin states, members of which, according to the designs of its authors, should include besides Japan, Australia and New Zealand, also ASEAN countries; China, South Korea, and also Hong Kong and Taiwan. These plans by Japan's leadership are causing serious concern in the countries of Southeast Asia, which consider, not without reason, that the new "Ohira doctrine" is in essence a modernized conception of creating a "greater Asian coprosperity sphere" promoted by the Japanese militarists in the years of World War II.

Japan's minister of foreign affairs, S. Okita, in an interview with the paper MAINICHI, was forced to admit the existence of concern among the ASEAN countries on this question. The heads of the Japanese Foreign Ministry affirm that the "Pacific Ocean concept" is limited solely to strengthening political and economic links between states of the Pacific region. However, as the Japanese communist paper AKAHATA stresses today, facts show that the "Ohira Doctrine" is inseparably linked with plans to create a new military bloc in that region nurtured by the ruling circles of the United States and Japan.

AFGHAN DEFENSE MINISTRY STATEMENT HITS 'IMPERIALIST' FORCES

LD081312 Moscow TASS in English 1301 GMT 8 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Kabul, January 8, TASS--Irrefutable facts and documents prove that throughout the period after the April revolution armed groups of gansters, instigated by imperialist and reactionary forces, conducted and are still conducting criminal activities against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. In the last three months they stepped up their intervention in the internal affairs of our country this was said in a statement broadcast here by the Ministry of National Defense of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

Supported by American imperialism, reactionary quarters of Pakistan, acting together with China and Egypt, staged military training of saboteurs from amidst traitors to the country in special camps in the Pakistani territory. Penetrating the territory of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, the armed gangsters perpetrate acts of terror and sabotage, plunder civilians and create an atmosphere of fear and violence.

American imperialism and its hangers-on do not conceal from the world the fact that it is precisely they that encourage, supply and arm the terrorists and killers beyond the boundaries of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, that it is precisely they that organize their pentration of territory of Afghanistan, the statement says. This has been borne out by testimony of prisoners and American and Chinese-made weapons seized from them and even those countries, prattling about "aid to refugees," thus admit their intervention in the affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

No sooner had the gang of Amin, the agent of the USA CIA, been liquidated and the resistance of terrorists and gansters had been broken, the statement says, than American imperialism, losing hope to overthrow our order through direct armed attacks, resorted to the weapon of brazen slander against our country, against the friend of our country, the Soviet Union, its disinterested aid to the Afghan people.

Neither the imperialist policy of intervention nor criminal actions of terrorists can break the will of the courageous people of Afghanistan. The National-Liberation Army, relying on support from the entire Afghan people, will put an end to the armed intervention by imperialism and reaction in the affairs of our country, the statement says in conclusion.

AFGHAN 'THRONG' ROAD TO MEET RELEASED POLITICAL PRISONERS

LD071552 Moscow TASS in English 1544 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Kabul, January 7, TASS--TASS correspondent Ravil Musin reports:

From early in the morning tens of thousands of men, women and children in the Afghan capital thronged the road leading to the gate of Kabul's Pole Charkhi Prison the name of which only recently was dreaded by the country's people. They came here to meet their relatives and family members who have been languishing in the dungeons of the citadel. After the new leadership of Afghanistan promulgated the decree on a general amnesty for political prisoners, almost each family started entertaining hopes to find their brothers, sisters, mothers, fathers, sons or daughters who had been unlawfully arrested in the short period of the rule of Amin's despotic and bloody regime.

By terror and violence Amin had pursued the course towards discrediting the gains of the April revolution and wrecking the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA). Many PDPA members as well as common workers, peasants, intellecturals clearly found themselves in dungeons without trial and investigation, Mohammed Akram, a teacher of the capital's lyceum--one of those who have been released--said in an interview with the TASS correspondent.

Over there in prison, he said, where hundreds and thousands of innocent people had been physically done away with before our very eyes a broad wave of indignation has been aroused by the words of President Carter--that "upholder of human rights" who quite of a sudden started shedding tears over the ostensibly "legitimate president of Afghanistan." Apparently President Carter really regretted the loss of such a man who had pursued the policy in imperialism's interests.

WIDESPREAD POPULAR SUPPORT FOR AFGHAN GOVERNMENT REPORTED

LD071644 Moscow TASS in English 1603 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Kabul, January 7, TASS--TASS correspondents Yuriy Kornilov and Ravil Musin report:

The main feature, which characterises the situation in Afghanistan today, is the unanimous and vigorous support by the people for the country's new leadership, support for its broad program of actions aimed at defending, developing and deepening the historical gains of the April revolution. Backed by this mighty support, the government embarked upon realisation of measures in restoration of revolutionary order in the country, implementation of important measures bound to improve the life of the people. This has been stated to the TASS correspondents by Anahita Ratebzadeh, minister of education of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan.

Over a period of 20 months, that passed after the April revolution, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan was subjected to ever-growing attacks on the part of imperialist and reactionary forces which have been seeking to undermine the gains of the revolution, to reverse the development of events, said A. Ratebzadeh. In these conditions the Afghan Government, proceeding from the treaty of friendship, goodneighbourliness and cooperation between the USSR and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan of 1978 and acting strictly in accordance with the U.N. Charter, approached the neighbouring and friendly country, the Soviet Union, with the request of aid. The USSR's consent to give such aid gives rise to profound gratitude of our people. The Afghan people know: Now the gains of our revolution are reliably protected from the external threat.

Measures to raise the cultural standards of the people, to give all the working people possibilities to get education, elimination of such a grave legacy of the past as illiteracy hold a very important place among the revolutionary transformations bound to change the image of the country, the minister said. Much has been done in this direction over the time which passed after the revolution. Suffice it to say, for instance, that more than half a million Afghans learnt how to read and write. But the schemings of imperialist enemies of Afghanistan and invigoration of activities of their agents inside the country, did not make it possible to carry through much of what has been planned. The task now is to remedy the situation. Our course is to involve intellectuals, officers of the people's army, students into the campaign to eliminate illiteracy.

Frustration of any measures, aimed at raising the cultural standards of the people is one of the aims of slanderous propaganda attacks which imperialism, reaction and their accomplices are waging against Afghanistan. But the Afghan people is fully determined to fulfil the program which has been put forward by the revolution, Anahita Ratebzadeh stressed in conclusion.

EVIDENCE OF U.S., PRC PROVOCATIONS SEEN IN AFGHANISTAN

LD072202 Moscow TASS in English 2112 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Kabul, January 7, TASS--TASS special correspondents Yuriy Kornilov and Ravil Musin report:

We see in front of us heavy machine guns and machine rifles, submachine guns, rifles and rapid-firing pistols "made in USA", "made in China". Near this heap of weapons we see thick batches of booklets and leaflets containing appeals to overthrow the people's regime established in Afghanistan after the April revolution. All this has been taken from members of counter-revolutionary gangs infiltrated into the territory of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan from abroad and captured by Afghan soldiers or arrested by organs of state security of the republic.

Officials at the Department of State Security of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan have shown us today the equipment of the bandit formations which do not cease armed attacks against the territory of sovereign Afghanistan and also several members of the routed counter-revolutionary groups.

Here we see one of them--Abdol Malek. This former criminal had fled the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan for Pakistan but there, too, he soon got into jail for a criminal offense. He said that a representative of the counterrevolutionary Afghan emigration offered him freedom on condition that he agree to become member of an armed detachment being formed to engage in subversive activity against the Democratic Afghanistan. Having obtained Malek's consent, his new masters sent him for "training" to a special military camp near Peshawar, Pakistan, where for several months he received specialized training under the guidance of U.S. and Chinese instructors. After this the bandit group of which Malek was part was secretly infiltrated into Afghanistan with the assignment to terrorise the population, to engage in subversive activities using every means including arson and assassinations and to obstruct the conduct of the land reform.

Abdollah Gol and Abdollah Basir are two other members of bandit gangs. They had both emigrated to Pakistan, tempted by the counterrevolutionary propaganda of the feudal lords and other reactionary elements. Soon they agreed to receiving training in specialized camps where they were, like Malek, trained by American and Beijing instructors to operate various types of weapons and to handle explosives. The bandits were prevented from applying the "knowledge" picked up from CIA agents and Beijing secret services: They were rendered harmless by Afghan security organs.

Of late, imperialist and reactionary circles have stepped up a frenzied slanderous campaign attempting to denigrate Afghanistan, said a high-ranking official of the state security organs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Abdol Kadyr Azin in an interview with a TASS correspondent.

This malicious slander is aimed, on the one hand, at calumnying Afghanistan and undermining Soviet-Afghan friendship and on the other, distracting the attention from the aggressive activities of imperialism.

The U.S.A. and China are using the territory of Pakistan for subversive activities against our country. Of late, over 20 thousand of different weapons of Western and Chinese make were secretly funnelled into Afghanistan and abroad. At present, there are about thirty so-called "special bases" in Pakistan which are financed mainly by the CIA and designed to form armed bandit gans for infiltration into Afghanistan. These facts give the lie to the vicious fabrications of the Western propaganda and clearly show that it is the imperialist and reactionary circles, in the first place those of the United States, that are grossly interfering in the internal affairs of the sovereign Afghanistan making futile attempts to undermine the accomplishments of our revolution , A.K. Azin said.

PRAVDA REPORTS KABUL RETURNING TO NORMAL; ENEMIES STILL ACTIVE

LD071547 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jan 80 p 5 LD

[P. Demochenko and L. Mironov article: "Despite Intrigues"]

[Text] Kabul--The Afghan capital has entered the new year with all signs of life returning to normal. Everywhere a relaxation of tension can be observed and people are feeling calmer and more confident.

As usual in a Muslim country the day begins with the call of the muezzins to morning prayer. The streets and the bazaars quickly fill with people. Although the curfew remains in force there are almost no military patrols or vehicles to be seen. They are insuring security only at the most important installations.

The two Kabul newspapers which began to appear on the last day of December are quickly sold out. One of them--HAQIQAT-E ENQELAB-E SAWR (TRUTH OF THE APRIL REVOLUTION) is being published straight off in the two languages which are most widespread here--Dari and Pashto. The other--KABUL NEW TIMES--is published in English.

"Yes, life is returning to normal," Nazmuddin, secretary of the Kabul City Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, told us. "But we are being impeded, greatly impeded." He showed us a leaflet being circulated around the city by a Maoist grouping. It contained an appeal for struggle against the new regime and for attacks on the Soviet Union and its aid to Afghanistan.

Disturbing news is arriving from the southern and eastern borders of the country. Radio stations of the imperialist intelligence services in the Pakistani cities of Peshawar and Quetta have broadcast inflammatory appeals for the intensification of armed interference in the affairs of Afghanistan. From the same sources came the news that Washington has decided to increase the financing and arming of the emigree rabble. During the past week, Peshawar broadcasts say, about 20,000 units of small arms and also much ammunition have been handed over by the Americans along to centers where armed formations are undergoing training.

"Everything testifies to the fact that our enemies are trying to continue the massive attack on the Afghan revolution," Anahita Ratbzadeh, minister of education, told us. "We see that the interference and threats from abroad are intensifying...."

So the tendency toward normalization of the situation and the Afghans' return to a peaceful life and work are encountering attempts to destabilize the situation and to prevent the people from deciding their own destiny for themselves. The newspaper Kabul NEW TIMES calls the propaganda campaign now being mounted by the United States against Afghanistan "demagogic and provocative." "The government of our Democratic Republic," the newspaper continues, "greatly appreciates the Soviet Union's positive reaction to the request to render Afghanistan aid against the aggressive actions of the imperialist and reactionary forces."

The article finishes on an optimistic note. "We are confident," the author writes, "that the final victory will be ours that the imperialists and reactionaries will not succeed in wrecking the creation in our country of a new society--a society of universal well-being, where nobody will be subjected to exploitation."

This is a noble aim. The leadership of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan is explaining to the people the principles for which they are waging the struggle.

IZVESTIYA CORRESPONDENTS REPORT ON FEELINGS IN KABUL

Mood of Confidence

LD041251 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Jan 80 Morning Edition p 5 LD

[Report by IZVESTIYA special correspondents V. Kassis and K. Rashidov: "Kabul Today"]

[Text] On New year's Eve Kabul was engulfed in snow, as if to order. Snow-topped cars and buses moved with great difficulty along the snow-bound streets. But the ministries, departments and other institutions began their working day as usual.

"As usual? That is not quite right," Ali Mohammad, Democratic Republic of Afghanistan [DRA] minister of planning, said. "We are working in the new way today. We are beginning a new chapter in the history of our motherland."

In fact, this idea was expressed by many people we spoke to. We met some colleagues in the lobby of the HAQIQAT-E ENQELAB-E SAWR editorial offices. The editorial meeting had just finished. We were surprised that some of the journalists were armed with submachine-guns: Today the Afghans are defending their revolution.

Against whom? (Asadollah Kishman), chief editor of the DRA central organ, was categorical on that score:

"The forces of foreign reaction and imperialism have been trying to stifle our revolution through their stooges, enemies of the Afghan people. But once again their endeavors have been in vain. We Afghans are grateful to our tried and tested friend and good neighbor, the Soviet Union. As in the past, it has answered our call and come to our assistance at a difficult time for the Afghan people.

The country is faced with serious political, organizational and economic problems. But the Afghan patriots and their vanguard--the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan [PDPA], under whose leadership the April revolution was carried out with the full support of all strata of the population--are fully resolved to overcome all the difficulties.

...The first day of the new year coincided with a significant event--the 15th anniversary of the creation of the PDPA. Its projected democratic transformations--whose ultimate aim is to build a new society free from man's exploitation of man--have become a matter for all the people. This is what Babrak Karmal, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee, chairman of the Revolutionary Council and prime minister of the DRA, spoke about on the radio and television.

A ceremonial session of Afghan leading organs with the participation of public representatives, devoted to the significant date, was held today, 2 January 1980. The session was held in an atmosphere of great enthusiasm in the Chekhel-Sotun Palace.

Western propaganda is hysterically clucking about "the hand of Moscow." Commenting on these pronouncements by "Western voices," the people we spoke to, be they workers, artisans, doctors or students, shrugged their shoulders: "The dog barks but the caravan moves on."

The Afghan people view the future with confidence. We have visited various parts of the capital and met and talked with representatives of the most diverse strata of the population.

The bazaars of old Kabul, with which the city once began before growing and becoming the Afghan capital, are usually picturesque. Here a kind of traditional island has been preserved amid the rapid flow of time, where despite the screech of car brakes, the neon advertisements and the girls dressed in tight jeans, the pulse of the ancient East continues to beat, with medieval labyrinths of countless alleyways along which merchants selling all kinds of wares sit at their tiny stalls. Their untranslatable cries are drowned in the hubbub of bazaar sounds. The quarters inhabited by cake sellers, butchers, copper smiths, potters, sellers of carpets and textiles and antique pottery extend over many kilometers like links in a single chain.

Not for nothing do people say that the bazaars are the main adornment of Eastern cities. This institution, drawn from ancient manuscripts and now featured in all tourist guidebooks, rather makes one compare the noisy, perpetually busy rows of traders with a mirror in which the experienced eye can see reflected the residents' way of life and culture and sometimes a barometer of economic and political life defining the citizens' moods. Indeed, you can hide nothing here. The bazaar in complex situations is like the reaction of a weathercock to a puff of wind. These days the animated business conversations of merchants and customers and the cigarette boys who scurry silently among the crowds speak for themselves.

Today the Kabul bazaar "barometer" is reading "clear." There is a great deal to lead to this conclusion. Above all it can be seen from every indication that the lifelines linking the bazaar with the countryside and the wholesalers have not been broken. In a word, the Afghan capital is living to the full. The airport, radio and television are operating and the movie theaters are open.

(Firuza Komil), a weaver in a textile factory, told your correspondents:

"We are extremely grateful to the Soviet people for the assistance they have given. You cannot express in a few words the bitterness which my people have had to go through. Today we are confident that this is finished forever."

Construction worker (Rim Piruz) stressed that the Soviet Union has been helping the Afghan people for 60 years. Evidence of this friendship is provided by the many enterprises which have been constructed with the help of Soviet friends.

"A tremendous thank you to you, dear Soviet friends," the Afghans say. ...And now we have in our hands the first issue of HAQIQAT-E ENQELAB-E SAWR, which has just been published. It publishes the contents of the government, a message from Babrak Karmal to Comrade L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, an appeal from Babrak Karmal to the people and a number of items connected with the country's internal life and the elimination of the consequences of the antipopular Amin regime; photographs tell of the release from prison of political prisoners, among them many women and children.

Indignation of People

LD071223 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Jan 80 Morning Edition p 5 LD

[Special correspondents V. Kassis and K. Rashidov report: "The People Defend the Revolution"]

[Text] Kabul--We are sending this report from one of Kabul's international radio centers armed with earphones and an ordinary microphone. We have been obliged to resort to this most unusual method because telephone and teletype communications with the outside world have been out of action for several days now. The reason? The latest terrorist act by the counterrevolutionary forces guided by international reaction.

The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan [DRA] Communications Ministry has announced that communications will be restored in literally just a few days.

"Our Soviet friends are rendering us invaluable aid in this respect," Afghan engineer Siddiq Gul Ahmad says. "Their experience and selflessness merit the warmest words of thanks. This is only one example of Soviet-Afghan relations and the close goodneighborly relations between the two countries. The chemical fertilizer plant in Mazari-Sharif, the power station in Naghlu, the large-scale irrigation complex in Jalalabad, the high-mountain railroad across the forbidding cliffs of the Hindu Kush are only a partial list of the most important built with the participation of Soviet specialists."

After the victory of the April revolution in Afghanistan this cooperation acquired a new quality and became even closer and more fruitful. The 5 December treaty on friendship, good-neighborliness and cooperation is graphic testimony to this.

"That is why, when our country was threatened, the Afghan Government's urgent request to the Soviet Union to render it immediate political, moral and economic aid, including military aid, was a natural matter logically prepared by the entire history of friendship between our peoples. It was precisely this which showed out tremendous trust in our selfless neighbor and friend," Shamahmud, a student at the Kabul Polytechnic Institute, says.

In this connection we recall events of the recent past linked with external and internal reaction's intrigues against the young republic.

. . . The man lay face down with his arms drawn in unnaturally beneath him. He still showed signs of life. But to all appearances his strength had left him. We saw this terrible scene played out literally a hundred paces from the IZVESTIYA correspondent's center in Kabul at a spot where a few minutes before the blast had occurred, alarming the entire block. But it was enough to ascertain what had happened for natural human sympathy for the dying man to be replaced by a wave of anger and indignation which swept over all those present. We had before us a terrorist, a saboteur who had intended to throw a grenade into the yard of the Khabibiya Lycee, which there were many children at the time.

But fate decreed otherwise. Something failed to work and the lethal weapon exploded in the hands of the bandit. A few minutes later a counterrevolutionary demonstration was attempted in Kabul. The blast at the lycee--like several other explosions in various part of the city--was to be a signal for a rebellion. But it was rapidly suppressed by the security forces with vigorous assistance from the capital's inhabitants, an official announcement stated.

The provocative actions by the enemies of the April revolution, the announcement emphasized, were implemented with support from foreign imperialist reactionary circles. This was borne out by documents and weapons confiscated from the rebels. All this was put on show to local and foreign journalists. We were shown a mass of weapons found in caches, including ideological weapons-subversive literature of every possible stripe.

At various times we have visited mountain villages where gangs of bandits were active and the same fate befell them as in Kabul. This is natural: The people are defending the revolution. But we want to talk about something else now--the cold cruelty of those who are trying to intimidate Afghan people and prevent them from marching along their chosen path of building a new life. Just think: to base your calculations on the murder of children!

Here is an account of the bandits' attacks by eye-witnesses.

"They not only burned down the school but also killed the teacher," (Mukhammad Dzhuna), an inhabitant of the little village of (Muskala) in Helmand Province, said. "He was a good, kind man, the only teacher in the school opened after the April revolution.

(M. Dzhuna's) fellow-villager (Isadar Mukhammad), in speaking of the gang's attack, could not conceal his emotion and profound hatred:

"These animals who have lost their humanity alleged that their actions were directed by Allah who was punishing us for some sins or other. But they themselves were punished by the almighty--they were all killed or taken prisoner by the glorious servicemen of the people's army."

Here is what MACLEAN'S CANADA magazine reported on New Year's Eve: The Afghan rebels strongholds are located on Pakistani territory. They all undergo training here. Thus, the magazine points out one of Pakistan's most dangerous and carefully guarded secrets has been revealed: The presence on its territory of Chinese Army officers and instructors who are working at these strongholds.

In the opinion of local observers the "ideologists and practicians of Afghan counter-revolution--Mottemadi Bulbeddin and Rahbani--are based in Pakistan. They are supported and financed by the United States and certain circles from Egypt, Saudi Arabia and some other Western countries. It is also being noted here that without the arms and ammunition deliveries, without the CIA's creation of camps for training the terrorists and saboteurs the whole motley crowd of enemies could not have held out for a single day. But the gangs are now undertaking hostile work against the organs of people's power in peripheral areas, hindering the operation of transport and so forth.

The forces of reaction are not abandoning their attempts to harm the gains of the April revolution. But what is characterisitic when you familiarize yourself with the country's life today is the people's aspiration by their joint efforts and relying on the aid of their Soviet friends, to liquidate their socioeconomic backwardness as rapidly as possible.

"The elimination of illiteracy is one of the main problems on this path," Dr Anahita Ratbzadeh, the minister of education, said in a talk with us. "The DRA Government is doing everything to insure that life returns to normal more rapidly and there is a great deal of multifaceted work to do."

On listening to this likeable woman whose life has been devoted to revolutionary struggle, we realized what great difficulties face her ministry and the entire DRA Government.

"The enemies of the revolution are trying to oppose the people's power, even using the fact that the overwhelming majority of the country's population is illiterate and that the countrywise has no cultural centers," Anahita Ratbzadeh continued. "Internal and external reaction has mounted a stormy anti-Afghan campaign but we are confident of our strength and our people, who will defend this revolution. The Afghan-Soviet treaty and the UN Charter are on our side. Our enemies, including small groupings of Maoists, are trying to unite. But we know for sure that the people will honorably withstand all trials and friendship with our great neighbor--the Soviet Union--is a reliable guarantee of our successes in the struggle for the Afghan people's happiness and prosperity."

'PROMINENT AFGHAN AUTHOR' SLAMS U.S. POLICY AS 'AGGRESSIVE'

LD081108 Moscow TASS in English 1037 GMT 8 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Kabul, January 8, TASS--The aggressive policy of the United States of America which, while continuing the course towards spiralling up the arms race, is at the same time trying by force, with the help of its agents or by launching massive calumniatory campaigns to undermine the cause of detente and peace, to pressurize other countries and peoples and to make them abandon sovereignty and an independent policy, cannot but arouse a serious concern among all people of good will, Asafulla Habib, a prominent Afghan author and cultural figure, said here. Revolutionary Afghanistan and its people resolutely come out against any attempts by imperialist and reactionary circles at reviving in the international arena the policy of heightening tension. Those are attempts doomed to failure, just as the efforts, by means of dirty lies and slander which are now being zealously exaggerated in Washington and some other Western capitals, to portray the matter in such a way as if Afghanistan fell victim to some "interference" on the part of the USSR, the author said.

KABUL MAYOR CITED: U.S. 'GROSSLY INTERFERING' IN AFGHAN AFFAIRS

LD071600 Moscow TASS in English 1550 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

["Afganistan: Devotion to Revolution"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, January 7, TASS--Kabul Mayor Sher Aga told an IZVESTIYA correspondent that "despite the existing difficulties of the internal and external political standing of the country, the work in putting into life the master plan of development of the Afghan capital, adopted after the April revolution, is going on. The main problem--construction of housing for the working people--is also being successfully coped with. Touching upon the anti-Soviet hysteria being fanned up by the United States and Beijing, the Kabul mayor has said: In our country we have no foreign military bases; our republic has always followed the lines of active neutrality and nonalignment; it has been fighting for peace and security in the region and the whole world.

"People say, said Sher Aga, an uneasy conscience betrays itself. Thus, the United States, now grossly interfering into internal affairs of sovereign Afghanistan tries to camouflage its aggressive policy which is conducted by it in the whole world. Take, for instance, such a fact: The Americans now have more than 2,500 military bases stationed in 114 countries.

The Americans would like through their agents and political placemen, of the Hafizollah Amin type, to impose their will also on our people but they will never succeed in doing so since siding with us are truth, sincere and true friends of the Afghan people--the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

PAKISTAN VIEWED AS 'SPRINGBOARD' FOR ANTI-AFGHAN AGGRESSION

LD071701 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1445 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

["An Unfriendly Stand"--TASS headline]

[Text] New York, 7 Jan, (TASS)--Niaz Naik, the permanent representative of Pakistan at the UN, delivered a speech at a session of the UN Security Council on Sunday on the so-called "Afghan question," the discussion of which was foisted on the Council at the instigation of the United States. The Pakistani representative exerted not a little effort to distort the relations between Pakistan and neighboring Afghanistan as being "the most friendly" and even "fraternal." The Pakistani representative has a very peculiar way of understanding "fraternal" relations, however. The whole world knows that specially built centers operate on Pakistani territory, where CIA agents and Chinese instructors teach the art of war to Afghan counterrevolutionary terrorists, supply them with weapons and transfer them to Afghanistan where they commit bloody acts of repression against the representatives of people's power and the peaceful population. In particular, one of the main centers for training armed gangs exists in Peshawar. In this way Pakistan has effectively been turned into a springboard for aggressive actions against neighboring Afghanistan.

Niaz A. Naik hypocritically attempted to portray support for Afghan counterrevolutionaries as some kind of "humanitarian assistance." All that can be said about such an assertion is that there is nothing the least bit new about the ploy which the Pakistani representative is resorting to. It is generally known that Washington and Beijing are intensively supplying the Pol Pot bands with weapons and food across the Thai border and likewise giving assurance that they are rendering "humanitarian assistance to refugees" from Kampuchea.

The Pakistani representative also used his speech in the Security Council to distort the nature of Soviet-Afghan relations and to mislead the public of Muslim and other countries about the true purposes of Soviet help to Afghanistan.

It should be stressed in conclusion that the prospects for normalization of the situation in South Asia depend to a large degree on Pakistan's position. If Pakistan continues to yield to the pressure of the imperialist powers--and above all to the United States--then, naturally, no good will come of it. If it really enters the path of sincere cooperation and goodneighborliness with Afghanistan then this will foster the establishment of genuine peace in this region.

Bad for People's Interests

LD081025 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jan 80 p 5 LD

[V. Baykov dispatch: "Bridgehead for Aggression"]

[Text] Islamabad--The city of Peshawar is situated at the very foot of a mountain range. The Afghan border is no more than 30 km away. Recently, however, Peshawar has become known not so much as a transit point on the traditional trade route to Afghanistan but as a bridgehead for the preparation of imperialist aggression against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan (DRA). [paragraph continues]

It has become the main support base for Afghan reactionaries who fled to Pakistan from the 1978 April revolution and are being utilized by U.S. and Beijing forces for outside subversive activity against the young republic.

A whole number of subversive headquarters have been set up in the city. One of them is housed in a two-story building behind a high mud wall with a black flag fluttering overhead like some sinister bird. This is the (Tanal) quarter of old Peshawar. Others are based in **the Fakirdabad, Gul Bahar, and (Dzhakhangirabad) quarters. Literature uring** urging armed struggle against the DRA Government is openly distributed here.

The ringleaders of the emigre rabble, exude malice and hatred for people's power, which has deprived them of privileges based on merciless exploitation of the Afghan people. A typical representative of this rabble is "front" leader M. Sibqhatullah Mojaddei. He is a wealth feudal landowner. When his vast lands were confiscated and distributed to landless peasants he fled over the border. By false promises and threats he induced several thousand of his fellow tribesmen to leave their homes of long standing.

The hostile forces thrown out of Afghanistan were given shelter by international reaction and knocked together into large armed formations for intervention against the DRA. Corresponding training is given in special camps set up on Pakistani territory--in **Northwest Frontier Province** Baluchistan, and other areas adjoining the DRA borders. American and Chinese instructors and also Pakistani Army officers are in charge of training.

The newspaper MUSAWAAT has described a camp in the region of Zjob in Baluchistan. A correspondent for the British newspaper THE GUARDIAN visited another camp in the village of (Varsak) 20 km north of Peshawab. According to him, a large detachment is undergoing military training there. These formations lack neither money nor weapons. Money and weapons are flowing in unabated from the United States, China and a number of Western countries.

During a tour of Afghanistan a year ago I visited Kandahar Province. Afghan Army officers showed me examples of Chinese, American and West German guns seized from interventionists and also large sums of foreign currency confiscated from them, including U.S. dollars and British pounds. This was convincing substantive evidence of what forces are opposed to the Afghan revolution. The French newspaper COURRIER DE POLITIQUE ETRANGERE has described how Chinese arms are supplied to camps near the Afghan border along the Karakorum highway across Pakistan.

Thus, aggressive actions against the Afghan revolution are being carried out from Pakistani territory on a large scale. These actions have been stepped up considerably in the last few days. In early December the ringleaders of the armed formations held a news conference in Peshawar at which they stated that they will continue the war against the DRA Government on the basis of assistance from the United States and other Western countries, China and the reactionary governments of certain Muslim states.

The development of imperialist aggression against the DRA from Pakistani territory is increasingly drawing Pakistan into dangerous scheming. Participation in such adventures in no way matches the Pakistani people's interests or the principles of good-neighborliness.

KAMPUCHEAN, SRV, LAO FOREIGN MINISTERS MEET

LD062342 Moscow TASS in English 1114 GMT 6 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Phnom Penh, January 6, TASS--The foreign ministers of Kampuchea, Vietnam and Laos have had a meeting here. Taking part in the meeting were Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of Kampuchea Hun Sen, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam, Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam Nguyen Duy Trinh, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party, Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of the People's Democratic Republic of Laos Phoun Sipaseuth.

In the course of the meeting the ministers exchanged opinions on the present-day international situation and the situation in Indochina, discussed questions of cooperation in the international arena. They reaffirmed the unbending determination to strengthen militant solidarity and fruitful cooperation between the peoples of their countries.

A joint communique on the results of the meeting has been signed. The communique stresses that the sides revealed full identity of views on all questions discussed. Speaking at the document-signing ceremony, Chairman of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Council Heng Samrin has highly appreciated the results of the meeting which became a vivid demonstration of unity and friendship of the fraternal countries of Indochina, their determination to continue fighting, shoulder to shoulder, against aggressive schemings of the Beijing expansionists and imperialists, to oppose the attempts of that reactionary alliance to undermine the revolutionary gains and security of the peoples of Kampuchea, Vietnam and Laos.

PEN SOVAN DISCUSSES MILITARY SITUATION IN KAMPUCHEA

LD062320 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1542 GMT 6 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Phnom Penh, January 6 (TASS)--The main proof of the correctness of the line chosen by the Kampuchean National United Front for National Salvation [KNUFNS] and the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Council [KPRC] is the fact that all attempts by the Chinese expansionists, American imperialists and international reaction to stifle the People's Republic of Kampuchea using political, military and economic actions have suffered a complete defeat, said Pen Sovan, KPRC vice president, minister of defense, and commander in chief of the revolutionary armed forces. The Kampuchean people recognize the KNUFNS, whose program has lit the path to the salvation and renaissance of the nation, as its leader, and they have complete confidence in the KPRC. No intrigues by enemies of the republic will be able to undermine the lofty authority of the KPRC among the masses, or to turn back the wheel of history.

In aspiring to hinder the development of Kampuchea along the path of socialism, Pen Sovan continued, the Beijing rulers placed their stakes on the remnants of the broken Pol Pot bands, which then still totaled about 65-70,000 men and hid themselves in the inaccessible mountain regions. With the help of Chinese "instructors," bases were set up by the Pol Potites in the jungles, where a large quantity of arms supplied from China, military means and food were kept. But the revolutionary armed forces, with the active help of the population, in a short time destroyed the strongholds of the enemy. After the liquidation of such strategic strongholds at the end of last March, from where Pol Pot and his assistants tried to organize the direction of his panic-stricken detachments, the Pol Potites lost their final hopes of success and escaped to the border regions of Thailand, where, with the connivance and direct support of the Thai authorities, they managed to find refuge.

In Kampuchea itself small scattered gangs of Pol Pot's followers have hidden in some remote forest areas. Avoiding clashes with the PRK's Armed Forces, they use weapons for assaults on and robbery of the civilian population. Operations aimed at the liquidation of the bandits are being carried out in these areas at present.

Thus during the last year Pol Pot's gangs, on whom Beijing has counted, were routed and do not represent a force either from the political or the military aspect.

As far as the different groups are concerned, which are being hurriedly knocked together by China and the United States with the Thai authorities' participation, who speak on behalf of Sihanouk, the former Lon Nol's followers and other rulers, ousted by the Kampuchean people, it can be said that these feverish attempts aimed at reviving the ousted regime "without Pol Pot" are also doomed to failure. The Kampuchean people know the true value of the semifeudal unprincipled policy of Sihanouk and the other Beijing henchmen. Having taken their destiny in their own hands, the people of Kampuchea will no longer allow anybody to be in charge of it.

Pen Sovan stressed that the KNUFNS and the KPRC base their policy on the great teaching of Marx, Engels, Lenin. Reviving its glorious revolutionary traditions, the Kampuchean people are strengthening their combat solidarity with fraternal peoples of Vietnam and Laos, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. He pointed out that the Soviet people were the first in the world to carry out a socialist revolution and they have paved the way along which the Kampuchean people now advance. The Soviet Union, together with Vietnam, were the first to give a helping hand to our country, which found itself in an extremely difficult situation because of the consequences of the criminal policy of the bloody regime of Beijing's henchmen. We have been able to overcome the danger of hunger in the country and many other difficulties thanks to this timely and effective support.

Pen Sovan said in conclusion that close friendship and solidarity with the socialist countries is the foundation of People's Kampuchea's foreign policy course. This friendship is a guarantee for the future victories of the Kampuchean people on the road to building an independent socialist Kampuchea. The socialist countries have proven that it is precisely they who are the main support of the peoples in their struggle for national independence. A noisy anti-Soviet campaign in connection with events in Afghanistan is now being unleashed in the West. The ruling circles of the United States and China, with the help of their agents, tried to strangle the Afghan revolution. The Kampucheans themselves have experienced the cruel and pitiless actions of imperialists and Maoists, who are trying to reclaim their lost positions. The help provided by the Soviet Union to Afghanistan at the request of that country's government has eliminated the danger hanging over the young republic as the result of interference in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan's internal affairs by international reactionaries. The Kampuchean people fully endorse this internationalist aid of the Soviet Government and express its support for the revolutionary struggle of the Afghan people.

LE DUC THO CITED ON VIETNAMESE TROOPS IN KAMPUCHEA

LD040933 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Dec 79 p 5 LD

[TASS report: "Hostile Ballyhoo"]

[Text] Hanoi, 28 December--The ballyhoo raised by Beijing, Washington and other reactionary circles over the question of the presence of Vietnamese troop units in Kampuchea pursues a definite aim--to clear the way for interference in Kampuchea's internal affairs, said Le Duc Tho, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Vietnam Communist Party Central Committee.

In raising the question of the withdrawal of Vietnamese units from the People's Republic of Kampuchea, the Beijing expansionists and hegemonists and imperialist and reactionary forces, he said, are hoping that, once these units have been withdrawn, these forces will be able to overthrow Kampuchea's revolutionary government and revive the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary regime or install Sihanouk in power.

The Vietnamese troop units are in Kampuchea at the request of the People's Revolutionary Council in accordance with the treaty between the two countries. This is in line with the principles of the UN Charter and international laws, Le Duc Tho noted. The Vietnamese units will not remain on Kampuchean territory even one day after the need for them has disappeared and the encroachments on Kampuchea by the Beijing expansionists and other reactionary forces have ceased, he stressed.

ALLEGED VIETNAMESE USE OF USSR-PRODUCED TOXINS DENIED

LD070923 [Editorial Report LD] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 December 1979 publishes on page 3, under the headline "Poisonous Wind of Lies," a 1,000-word article by Lt Col Ye. Aleksandrov, strongly rejecting Western and Chinese allegations that "Vietnam has used in Laos and Kampuchea poisonous substances supplied by the Soviet Union." Proclaiming that "curare and cyanide look harmless compared with the poison of lies and slander cooked up in the propaganda kitchens of the West and China," Aleksandrov notes that "even a special Washington commission" "failed to find any evidence" corroborating the charges. Aleksandrov goes on to contrast this lack of evidence with the "American military's glaring crimes" during the Vietnam war as exemplified in the use of defoliants and other chemicals.

CULTURAL, TECHNICAL COOPERATION PROTOCOL SIGNED WITH SINGAPORE

LD041220 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 3 Jan 80 LD

[Text] And now over to Singapore. Recent time has seen the fruitful development of Singapore's contacts with the Soviet Union in diverse areas. The two states have just signed a protocol on cultural, scientific and technical cooperation. Our Singapore correspondent Albert Papayan has telephoned this dispatch:

The program for cultural and scientific exchange was signed between Singapore and the Soviet Union. This program was the (?fourth) one signed between the two countries since the establishment of the diplomatic relations. In a speech after the signing, the acting permanent secretary of foreign affairs, Mrs Tan Boon Seng said that since their inception the programs have contributed to the promotion of friendship and understanding between the peoples of the countries. (?Various) achievements in the field of scientific research and the richness of the culture of the USSR are well-known, she went on to say. This cultural and scientific exchange program, Mrs Tan stressed, will enable Singaporeans to appreciate the customs, traditions and achievements of the USSR in greater depth. On the other hand, Singaporeans are happy to share their experience in promoting a multicultural way of life of the Soviet Union. Both Singapore and the Soviet Union desire to improve bilateral relations in all possible fields and this annual cultural and scientific exchange program will undoubtedly play a major part in the achievement of this objective by promoting closer ties between these two countries and better understanding of the (?national life) of the peoples of Singapore and the USSR. The program is an important contribution to the good relations between the two countries.

SUSLOV, PONOMAREV GREET MARCHAIS ON ARRIVAL IN MOSCOW

LD071744 Moscow TASS in English 1725 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Moscow, January 7, TASS--Today, at the invitation off the CPSU Central Committee, a delegation of the French Communist Party [PCF], headed by the General Secretary of the French Communist Party Georges Marchais, has arrived in Moscow today. The delegation includes member of the Politbureau, secretary of the Central Committee of the PCF Maxime Gremetz; member of the Politbureau of the PCF Francette Lazard; members of the Central Committee of the PCF Daniel Monte and Jean-Paul Magnon; deputy head of the International Department of the Central Committee P. Lemaec.

At the airport, the delegation was met by member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Suslov; alternate member of the Politbureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Boris Ponomarev; member of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Presidium of the Union of Soviet Societies of Friendship and Cultural Ties with Foreign Countries Zinaida Kruglova; alternate member of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee Vadim Zagladin and other officials of the CPSU Central Committee.

PONOMAREV CONFERS WITH NORWEGIAN CP HEAD IN MOSCOW

LD081251 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jan 80 p 4 LD

[TASS report: "Meeting at CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] A meeting took place at the CPSU Central Committee 4 January between B.N. Ponomarev, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Commitee, and V.S. Shaposhnikov, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, and M.G. Knutsen, chairman of the Norwegian Communist Party [NKP].

During the meeting a comradely exchange of opinions took place on certain topical problems of international life, and also on questions of the further development of the ties between the CPSU and the NKP.

The opinion was expressed unanimously that the decision adopted by the December NATO Council session on the production and deployment in West Europe of new types of American nuclear-missile weapons is an attempt to violate the established equilibrium of forces and began the next spiral in the arms race, which hinders the relaxation of international tension.

In this connection joint emphasis was placed on the urgent need to develop a broad struggle by all peace-loving forces advocating detente and disarmament with a view to preventing the implementation of that dangerous NATO decision which constitutes a serious threat to the security of the European peoples. In particular the importance of resolute opposition to any impulses toward involving north Europe in the implementation of these NATO plans was noted.

The two sides expressed the desire to strengthen cooperation between the CPSU and the NKP and to do everything to promote the further development of the relations between the Soviet Union and Norway in the spirit of good neighborliness and mutual trust in the interests of the Soviet and Norwegian peoples and of the cause of peace and security in north Europe, Europe and the world.

The meeting took place in the warm, cordial atmosphere which is characteristic of the fraternal relations between the CPSU and the NKP.

TURKISH GOVERNMENT DISCUSSES MILITARY ULTIMATUM

LD081051 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jan 80 p 5 LD

[TASS report under the general headline "No Way Out Has Been Found"]

[Text] Ankara, 4 January--A government session has taken place here under the chairmanship of Turkish Prime Minister S. Demirel; it discussed the ultimatum given to President F. Koruturk by the country's military leadership. The military leaders' statement contains a warning that unless the political leadership adopts measures to insure order and tranquility in the country, the army will step in and "execute its duty in the protection and guardianship of the republic." Western observers believe that this indicates the army's intention to seize power.

Answering journalists' questions after the session, S. Demirel rejected the possibility of creating a coalition government with the participation of the leading opposition party, the Republican People's Party (CHP).

At a session of the CHP parliamentary group B. Ecevit, the party leader, familiarized the deputies with the content of the military leaders' statement. Ecevit said that this step by the military indicates the seriousness of the crisis in Turkey. He stressed the CHP's determination to promote in every way the resolution of the acute problems facing the country. Ecevit noted that the CHP has repeatedly proposed to S. Demirel that talks be held between the country's two major parties on these questions, but there has been no response to the proposals.

Antiterrorism Bill

LD081053 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jan 80 p 5 LD

[Correspondent A. Filippov report under the general headline "No Way Out Has Been Found"]

[Text] Ankara, 4 January--The Turkish parliament has begun the discussion of a bill on combating the terror unleashed by extremist organizations. The scale of the violence which has gripped Turkey is indicated by figures cited in parliamentarians' speeches: In 2 years 2,650 people have died at the hands of terrorists and more than 10,000 citizens have been wounded. As a rule the victims are representatives of progressive forces advocating a peaceful, democratic path of development for the country.

Observers on CUMHURIYET and other newspapers note that the statement given to Turkish President F. Koruturk by the leadership of the armed forces has influenced the speed of discussion of that bill.

It is reported that the leading opposition force, the Republican People's Party, has come out in support of the measures to combat anarchy which the bill contains.

'HOOLIGANS' ATTACK AFGHAN EMBASSY IN TEHRAN

LD071838 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

[Text] A representative of the Embassy of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in Tehran has stated that a large group of hooligans broke into the premises of the embassy yesterday and smashed up offices and diplomats' apartments. It was possible to establish that a part was taken in this bandit raid by former agents of the shah's secret police, SAVAK; members of a Maoist group; and also other reactionary elements. The spokesman noted that the Islamic Revolution Guards who came to the scene of the incident stopped the rampaging wreckers and removed them from the embassy premises.

ACTIVITIES OF CIA, SAVAK 'STEPPED UP' IN IRAN

LD071140 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0100 GMT 7 Jan 90 LD

[Text] The activities of CIA agents and former SAVAK members have been stepped up in Iran. The country's population sees this as the reason why disturbances have become worse in certain regions of the country.

Armed clashes have again taken place in Tabriz and there have been casualties.

Provocateurs have come out under slogans directed outright against Ayatollah Khomeyni.

Clashes have also taken place in Bandar 'Abbas.

In Esfahan, SAVAK agents assassinated the head of the Islamic Revolution committees.

Special services of the United States of America have set various political and religious groups against one another, attempting to unleash fratricidal disagreement [rozn]

Khomeyni on Armed Clashes

LD071938 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

[Text] Speaking on Tehran Radio, Ayatollah Khomeyni said that the armed clashes which have taken place in various Iranian towns were the consequences of a plot directed toward wrecking the presidential elections due to take place 25 January. He called on the population of the country to show restraint and calm in the face of incessant provocations by U.S. imperialism against the Iranian revolution. We want only one thing, Khomeyni stressed, that our country should be free and should be allowed to dispose of its national resources.

WALDHEIM OPPOSES USE OF FORCE TO FREE HOSTAGES

LD072007 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

[Text] A TASS correspondent reports from New York:

UN Secretary General Waldheim has criticized attempts by certain circles in the United States to overcome the American-Iranian crisis through the use of force.

"Such methods," he said in an interview with the ABC television network, "will not solve the problem. As head of an international organization pursuing peaceful aims, I must stress that one should look for peaceful ways of settling the crisis. As far as the desire to begin a military operation is concerned, this would only threaten the lives of the hostages in the U.S. Embassy in Tehran. A solution of the problem would also not be helped by the American proposal that the UN Security Council should introduce sanctions against Iran," Waldheim went on to say. "This crisis requires integrated settlement. The interests of Iran, which is demanding extradition of the shah and investigation of human rights violations by the shah's regime, must of course be taken into account."

Report on Visit

LD072130 Moscow TASS in English 1947 GMT 7 Jan 80 LD

[Text] New York, January 7, TASS--Published here today has been a report of UN Secretary General Kurt Waldheim to the Security Council on his recent visit to Iran to find ways of settlement of the crisis in American-Iranian relations. In the report Kurt Waldheim informs the Security Council in detail about his negotiations in Tehran with Foreign Minister of Iran Sadeq Gotbzadeh and also members of the Revolutionary Council.

In the report it is noted that Kurt Waldheim discussed with members of the Iranian leadership a possibility of setting up an international committee that would carry out an investigation in connection with declarations on gross violations of human rights and unlawful acts which took place under the previous regime in Iran. The secretary general stresses in conclusion that the trip to Tehran was useful and helped him understand better the many-faceted character of the existing crisis, to more clearly size up the stand of the Iranian leaders. Kurt Waldheim admits that the present report by no means contains solution of the extremely delicate and complicated problem, but, as he said, in it there are a number of elements and ideas which can ensure the basis for a further consideration of the crisis by the Security Council.

IZVESTIYA NOTES SAUDI ARABIAN MILITARY CHANGES

LD071021 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Jan 80 Morning Edition p 4 LD

[Unattributed report from R. Tuchnin "World Today" feature: "Saudi Arabia: Reshuffle in Military Posts"]

[Text] Considerable changes have been made in the top military posts in Saudi Arabia's Army and security forces.

According to reports received in Beirut, King Khalid has issued a special edict appointing Lt Gen Muhammad as-Salih al-Hamid chief of the Saudi Armed Forces General Staff. His predecessor in the post was recently discharged. The king has also appointed a new head for the Main State Security Administration, which is entrusted with the responsibility for insuring the protection of the country's borders. There have been changes in the posts of commanders of the ground forces, air force and special security forces and governor of the city of Mecca.

Political commentators link this change with the recent events in that city, where a group of armed people held the main Muslim holy place--the Ka'bah Mosque--for a long time.

ETHIOPIA ANNOUNCES NEW GOVERNMENT APPOINTMENTS

LD071605 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jan 80 p 4 LD

[TASS report: "Changes in the Government"]

[Text] Addis Ababa, 2 January--Ethiopia's Provisional Military Administrative Council [PMAC] has made partial changes in the composition of the country's provisional military government. New appointments have also been announced in the Ministry of Defense.

According to a PMAC resolution published today, Lt Col Fisseha Desta, deputy secretary general of the PMAC, has at the same time been appointed senior minister of the government. Brig Gen Tesfaye Gebre-Kidan, member of the PMAC Standing Committee, has assumed the post of minister of defense, while Brig Gen Taye Tilahun, former minister of defense, has been appointed minister of the interior.

CENTRAL COMMITTEE GREETS CONGOLESE PARTY ON ANNIVERSARY

LD071541 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Dec 79 p 1 LD

[Text of message from the CPSU Central Committee to the Congolese Workers Party Central Committee, conveying congratulations on the 10th anniversary of its founding]

[Text] To the Congolese Workers Party [PCT] Central Committee

Dear comrades:

The CPSU Central Committee sends you friendly congratulations on the 10th anniversary of the foundation of the PCT.

The creation of the PCT and the program it proclaimed for building a new society on the basis of the principles of scientific socialism were an important gain for the Congolese people. Following the PCT's appeals, the working people of the People's Republic of the Congo are making increasingly resolute efforts aimed at eradicating the consequences of colonial rule, creating an independent economy, boosting the national culture, and asserting the anti-imperialist orientation of the country's development.

The implementation of the decisions of the Third Extraordinary PCT Congress this year is creating favorable new opportunities for successful advance along this path.

At this portentous time, Soviet communists reaffirm their solidarity with the Congolese people and their support for their aspirations for national and social progress. In fulfilling the decisions of the 25th congress, the CPSU firmly and consistently steers a course toward the consolidation of all-round friendly relations with the developing countries on the basis of equal rights and mutual respect, resolutely opposes the imperialist powers' interference in the affairs of young states, and persistently struggles for peace and against the arms race imposed by imperialism and undermining the peoples' creative efforts.

We wish the PCT great successes in the struggle to build a new life, the struggle for the prosperity and well-being of the friendly Congolese people.

May the relations of friendship and cooperation between our parties and peoples strengthen and develop.

[Signed] The CPSU Central Committee.

REPORT ON ADOPTION OF ELECTION CANDIDATES

LD032226 [Editorial Report LD] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 3 January reports the following adoption made at constituency preelection meetings on 3 January. The epithet "Eminent Figure of the Communist Party and the Soviet State" precedes the announcement of the names of Kosygin, Suslov, Kirilenko and Chernenko. The adopted candidates are listed in the order given by the radio.

Leonid Brezhnev	Baumanskiy Constituency, Moscow and Kalininskiy Constituency, Moscow
Aleksey Kosygin	Frunzenskiy Constituency, Moscow
Mikhail Suslov	Avtozavodskiy Constituency, Tolyatti
Andrey Kirilenko	Politekhnicheskiy Constituency, Leningrad
Konstantin Chernenko	Kuybyshev Constituency, Moscow
Yuriy Andropov	Priokskiy Constituency, Gorkiy
Viktor Grishin	Veshnyakovskiy Constituency, Moscow
Andrey Gromyko	Kaliningradskiy Constituency, Moskovskaya Oblast
Dinmukhamed Kunayev	Bakanas Constituency, Alma-Atinskaya Oblast
Arvid Pelshe	Krasno-Oktyabrskiy Constituency, Volgograd
Grigoriy Romanov	Smolnenskiy Constituency, Leningrad
Nikolay Tikhonov	Obukhovskiy Constituency, Leningrad
Dmitiry Ustinov	Frolovskiy Constituency, Vladimirskaya Oblast
Vladimir Shcherbitskiy	Bagley Constituency, Dnepropetrovskaya Oblast

GRISHIN ATTENDS MOSCOW CONSTITUENCY PRE-ELECTION MEETING

LD032240 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 3 Jan 80 LD

[Excerpts] Constituency pre-election meetings began in our country today in an atmosphere of high political activity. The pre-election meeting of representatives of the working people of Moscow Baumanskiy electoral ward was an exciting demonstration of the monolithic cohesion of the Soviet people around Lenin's Communist Party. Grishin, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee, war and labor veterans and socialist competition frontrankers, were in the presidium. The meeting was opened by Comrade (Kupreyev), first secretary of the Baumanskiy party raykom. (Yudachov), radio fitter of the tabulating machine plant, is on the rostrum.

The participants in the meeting made a request to Leonid Ilich Brezhnev to give his consent to stand for deputy to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet for Moscow's Baumanskiy Electoral Ward.

DOBRYNIN AWARDED ORDER OF LENIN

LD041442 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 4 Jan 80 LD

[Excerpts] It is reported today that Kuznetsov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member and first deputy chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, presented USSR orders in the Kremlin to a group of award-winners.

Dobrynin, USSR ambassador to the United States, received the Order of Lenin. Nikigorov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences received the Order of the October Revolution. The diploma awarding the military title of marshal's star was presented to Army General (Apaturov). In the name of the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Soviet Government and Leonid Ilich Brezhnev personally, Comrade Kuznetsov warmly and cordially congratulated the award-winners and wished them new successes in labor for the good of the homeland.

CSA REPORTS JANUARY-NOVEMBER 1979 STOCKRAISING FIGURES

LD070941 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 52 signed to press 17 Dec 79 p 16 LD

[Unattributed "January-November Review": "Stockraising on Kolkhozes and Sovhozes"--First paragraph is EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA introduction]

[Text] The Editorial Board has received USSR Central Statistical Administration data on the state of stockraising on kolkhozes and sovkhozes in the first 11 months of the year.

Despite the severe drought in a number of regions of the country during the livestock pasturing period and also the unfavorable weather conditions during the fall fodder procurement, kolkhozes and sovkhozes prevented any appreciable decrease in stockraising productivity. Livestock units' average annual output for the country as a whole will be greater in the first 4 years of the 10th 5-Year Plan than it was in the ninth. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes are taking every possible measure to provide the country with more meat, milk, eggs and other products.

I. Production of Livestock Products

The country's kolkhozes and sovkhozes had the following results in the production of livestock products in January-November of the current year:

Indicators	January-November 1979	January-November 1979 as percentage of January-November 1978
Meat production (live weight of livestock and poultry sold for slaughter)--thousand tons	14,619	99
including		
cattle	8,653	98
pigs	3,532	98
sheep and goats	1,049	96
poultry	1,385	109
Gross milk yield--thousand tons	61,075	98
Average milk yield per cow--kilograms	2,184	97
Hen eggs obtained--millions	38,818	104
Average egg production of laying hens	184	99.5

In the past 11 months the production of all types of livestock and poultry on kolkhozes and sovkhozes has remained approximately at the level of the same period last year. Overall, the gross milk yield on farms in January-November this year showed a fall of 1,248,000 tons. At the same time dairy unit workers in the Uzbek, Georgian, Azerbaijan, Moldavian, Kirgiz, Tadzhik, Armenian and Turkmen SSR managed to increase output by between 2 and 10 percent compared with January-November last year.

Egg production on kolkhozes and sovkhozes increased by 1,513 million during the period. This increase was obtained on the farms of most union republics except Georgia, Latvia, Turkmenia and Estonia, where egg production decreased somewhat.

II. Purchases of Livestock Products from Kolkhozes, Sovkhozes and Other State Farms.

Types of output purchased	Purchases in January-November 1979	January-November 1979 as percentage of January-November 1978
Livestock and poultry (live weight)--thousand tons	14,296	99
Milk-thousand tons	52,921	97
Eggs--millions	36,593	104

The volume of sales to the state of livestock and poultry by kolkhozes, sovkhozes and other state farms in January-November 1979 was only 1 percent down on the same period last year. The average weight of cattle sold by kolkhozes and sovkhozes was 362 kg. The average weight of pigs was 103 kg.

Milk purchases over the 11 months decreased compared with the same period of 1978 on farms in the RSFSR, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia. In the RSFSR the greatest decrease in sales of this product in January-November was on farms in Vologodskaya, Novgorodskaya, Pskovskaya, Vladimirskaya, Kalininskaya, Kaliningradskaya, Kaluzhskaya and Kostromskaya oblasts and the Mordovskaya, Chuvashskaya, Bashkirskaya and Tatarskaya ASSRs. At the same time kolkhozes and sovkhozes in Ulyanovskaya, Novosibirskaya and Chelyabinskaya oblasts and Altayskiy and Krasnoyarskiy krays increase milk sales by 1-3 percent.

Egg sales to the state showed an increase of 1,562 million against January-November last year.

III. Production and Purchases of Livestock Products for the Union Republics

January-November 1979 as percentage of January-November 1978

	Production			Purchases		
	Meat	Milk	Eggs	Livestock and poultry	Milk	Eggs
USSR as a whole	99	98	104	99	97	104
RSFSR	98	98	104	98	97	104
including:						
Non-Chernozem Zone	97	97	106	96	95	106
Ukrainian SSR	99.2	96	104	99.9	96	104
Belorussian SSR	101	98	105	101	97	106
Uzbek SSR	107	110	111	107	110	110
Kazakh SSR	96	100.5	104	97	100.3	103
Georgian SSR	102	102	99	104	102	100.4
Azerbaijan SSR	103	104	107	105	103	108
Lithuanian SSR	98	95	102	98	95	105
Moldavian SSR	107	107	110	107	108	113
Latvian SSR	90	96	97	89	93	98
Kirgiz SSR	98	105	106	100.9	105	109
Tadzhik SSR	102	107	122	103	107	122
Armenian SSR	104	105	112	105	107	113
Turkmen SSR	100.6	105	99	100.4	104	101
Estonian SSR	98	99.1	98	96	97	100.3

IV. Numbers of Livestock

As of 1 December 1979 the number of cattle on kolkhozes and sovkhozes totaled 88.9 million head--1,042,000 more than on the same date last year. The number of cows was 29.4 million--an increase of 383,000.

The number of pigs was 56 million and the number of sheep and goats 118.6 million--which is 596,000 more than on the same date last year. The number of poultry was 593.4 million--an increase of 38,406,000.

The number of cattle increased on the kolhozes and sovkhozes of all union republics. The number of pigs decreased on farms in the RSFSR, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Lithuania, Moldavia and Armenia. But on kolkhozes and sovkhozes in Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Latvia, Turkmenia and Estonia numbers increased 7-15 percent.

The number of sheep and goats increased somewhat for the country as a whole. However, there was a decrease in numbers on farms in RSFSR, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Lithuania and Latvia.

According to the figures for 1 December 1979, fodder stocks per standard head of livestock on the country's kolkhozes and sovkhozes were somewhat smaller than on the same date last year. That is why the most rational use of all available fodder resources and the organization of uninterrupted work by fodder shops to produce full-value fodder assume particular importance.

The CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and All-Union Komsomol Central Committee resolution "On the Development of All-Union Socialist Competition Among Stockraising Workers To Increase Production and Procurements of Livestock Products in the 1979-1980 Winter Period" instructs local party, soviet, Komsomol and trade union organs to widely propagandize and disseminate the experience of leading stockmen, livestock units, teams, kolkhozes, sovkhozes, rayons and oblasts and to determine specific measures to provide incentives for the winners of the socialist competition among farmstead workers. Every possible measure must be taken on every sovkhoz and kolkhoz to carry out livestock wintering more successfully and to prevent the reduction of livestock productivity and numbers.

RADIO REPORTS AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENTS 26 DECEMBER

LD290214 [Editorial Report LD] The following is a compilation of reports on agricultural developments in the USSR carried by Moscow domestic service in Russian on 26 December. Times of broadcasts are given in parentheses at the end of each paragraph:

Mass snow retention has started in north, west and central oblasts of Kazakhstan, accumulating snow on 4 million hectares to date. In all, Kazakh farms plan to carry out snow retention on 30 million hectares in order to create a reliable source of moisture for the spring sowing season. (0500 GMT)

Winter training of kolkhoz and sovkhoz workers has started in Uzbekistan. Nearly 160,000 persons are involved. Latvian land improvers have started work on overmoistened lands using new equipment which allows them to penetrate the frozen soil. This winter they have resolved to fulfill one-quarter of their annual tasks and make 63,000 hectares of improved lands available to farmers next year. (0700 GMT)

Sowing of winter crops is coming to an end in Tadzhikistan. They already occupy 192,500 hectares, which is considerably more than at the same time last year. (0900 GMT)